Leviathan

Drawn out with

A HOOK:

Cyp. OR Wilmer

ANIMADVERSIONS

Will. UPON Gossip 1744

Mr *HOBBS*

HIS

LEVIATHAN.

Together with some

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

Sr WALTER RALEIGH'S

Hiſtory of the WORLD.

LONDON,

Printed by *Tho. Newcomb*, for *Richard Royſton* at the Angel in *Ivy*-Lane. 1653.

Leviathan

Dewrout with

A HOOK:

OR

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON

MR. OBBS

HIS

LEVIATHAN.

Together with some

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

WALTER RALEIGH'S

History of the WORLD.

LONDON,

Printed by Tho. Newcomb, for Richard Royden at the Angel in Ley-Lane. 1658.

LEVIATHAN
drawn out with a
HOOK.
OR
ANIMADVERSIONS
UPON
Mr HOBBS
HIS
LEVIATHAN.

By ALEX. ROSSE.

LONDON,
Printed by Tho. Newcomb, for Richard Royston at the Angel in Ivy-Lane. 1653.

LEVIATHAN

drawn out with a

HOOK.

OR

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON

Mr HOBBS

HIS

LEVIATHAN.

By ALEX. ROSS.

LONDON,

Printed by Tho. Newcomb for

To the Right Worshipful
FRANCIS LUCY Esq;

SIR,

THe Giant Goliah *so affrighted the whole host of* Israel, *by the vast bulk of his body, the weight and large dimensions of his spear and armor, with his defying and bragging words, that none of all that Army durst encounter him. Only*

A David a Shepherd by profession, in stature low, in years young, the least of all his brethren, and of meanest account among the people, took the boldness to enter the lists with that uncircumcised Philistim. So I a spiritual shepherd by profession, the least of the Tribe of Levi, little in my own eyes, and of small account in the world, observing how all the host of learned men in this Land look upon, but adventure not to

buckle

buckle with Mr. Hobbs *his* Leviathan, Nec quisquam ex agmine tanto audet adire virum, manibusve inducere cæstus. *I say, being animated by some lovers of the truth, have this Summer set aside for a while my other studies, to peruse this book, and to detect some of his chief Tenets, which though erroneous and dangerous, are swallowed down by some young Scioliſts without nauseating, which to me is an*

argument of great distemper in the mindes and affections of men, who with the Israelites loathing the Manna of true Phylosophy and Divinity, covet after the Quailes of new errors, or rather old in a new guise, which in the end will poyson them. Me thinks I see Religion and learning, Divinity and true Phylosophy, devotion and piety, for which this Island hath been glorious for many generations, saying as the voice that the

Christians heard in Jerusalem *immediately before the destruction thereof*, Migremus hinc. *These are the* Palladia, *and as it were the* Tutelar *gods, by which this British Empire hath so long stood, which if they forsake us, what are we else but a prey to our enemies: God grant we may not complain of their departure, as* Aenæas *did of his* Trojan *gods*, Excessere omnes aditis, arisque relictis Dii quibus imperium hoc

steterat. *For do we not see how Athism strives to justle out Religion, how ignorance is crawling up into the chair of learning; how piety is affronted by profaneness; and devotion by irreverance; how divinity is assaulted by heretical opinions; and solid Phylosophy by dreams and fanatical whimsies. I doubt not but I shall be blamed by some for encountring this Champion of* Malmsbury, *as* David *was for venturing upon that*

Champion of Gath; *but I will answer them in* David's *words.* 1 Sam. 17. 29. What have I now done, is there not a cause? Goliah *defied the whole host of* Israel, *and Mr.* Hobbs *defyeth the whole host of learned men; esteeming his* Leviathan *as formidable and unconquerable, as that in* Job 41. 16. of whose Majesty the mighty are afraid, and for fear they faint in themselves, *but this* Leviathan *is not so*; *For* a Hook may

be cast into his nose, and his jawes may be pierced with an angle, Job 40.21.

Sir, this piece (which makes its addresses to you, as to one truly judicious, pious, and a lover of solid learning) is but small, so was David, *who notwithstanding foiled* Goliah; *the Ichneumon is but a small rat, yet it can kill the great Crocodile*; in est sua gratia parvis, *small things have their magnitude, though not of bulk, yet of vertue,*

there

there is more nourishment in a small Lark, then in a great kite or raven; and so there is more lustre in a small Diamond then in a whole quarry of other stones; even as a little Bee, so in this little Book there may be much spirit, ingentes animos angusto in corpore gestat. But how small soever it be, it hath drawn out Leviathan *with an Hook, which it presents to you; and so do I by it, my thankful acknowledgments for all your favours;*

favours; praying for an increase of all happiness on your self, your religious Lady, and your hopeful son my scholler with the rest of your Family: wherein the hearty desire of

Your most humble Servant

ALEX: ROSSE.

To the Reader.

GOod Reader, *David* encountred with a Lion, and a Bear; *Daniel* conversed among Lions; *Paul* fought with Beasts at *Ephesus*; *Hercules* skirmished with an *Erymanthian* Boar, a *Nemean* Lion, a *Lernean* Hydra; *Aeneas* with his sword against the shadows of *Centaures*, *Harpies*, *Gorgons*, and *Chimeras*; but I have to do with a strange monster, called *Leviathan*, which some one of *David*, *Psa.* 104. think to be

a Whale; the Prophet *Isaiah* calls him a piercing and crooked Serpent; *Job* saith, [He is a beast with fearful teeth, with scales strong as shields, with a heart as strong as the nether millstone, out of his mouth leap sparkes of fire, and smoke out of his nostrils.] Lastly, some there are that take him for the devil, and indeed he may be so; but he is said in *Job*, to be [a King over all the children of pride.] I hope Mr. *Hobbs* is not of his subjects, and yet his book is much inflamed with pride against learning and learned men. But in my opinion this paper Dragon is like that

beast

beast in the Revelation, [which opened his mouth into blasphemy against God, and his Tabernacle, and against them that dwell in heaven. *Rev.* 13. 6. Against God, in saying, [he made the world by nature, and by consequence of necessity, whereas he made it indeed voluntarily and freely. 2. In making the three Persons of the Trinity rather names then substances. 3. In making Christ onely to personate God the Son. 4. In making God the author of sin. 5. In making him coporeal, and part of the the universe.] Against his Tabernacle, that is, against his Church, [in labouring to

over-

overthrow her faith, knowledg, miracles, and ordinances.] Against them, that dwell in heaven, that is, the Angels and separated ſouls, [in making the one but fancies and dreams, and the others mortal, and not capable hereafter of any other happineſs then earthly.] He tells us beſides, [that faith is not by inſpiration, or infuſion, but by ſtudy and induſtry, that to beleeve in God, is not to truſt in his Perſon, but to confeſs the doctrine. That our belief is in the Church, that they were not devils, but madmen which confeſſed Chriſt, that covetouſneſs and ambition and injuſtice with power are ho-

honorable, that tyrants and good Princes are all one; that a man may sin against his conscience; that men should not render a reason or account of their faith; that Princes are not subject to their own laws; that private men have no property in their goods; that our natural reason is the word of God; that divine dreams cannot with belief; that it was a winde, not the holy Spirit which in the Creation moved on the waters; that the dove and fiery-tongues may be called Angels; that Christ hath no spiritual kingdom here on earth; that he did not cast out devils, but onely cured madnes; that Satan

tan did not enter into *Judas*; that we may dissemble in matter of religion; that we may disobey Christ and his Apostles without sin] Such, and much more like stuff and smoke, doth this [*Leviathan* send *out of his nostrils, as out of a boyling pot or caldron*, Job 41. 20.] This is the *spermacete*, or spawn which this whale casteth out; a whale, I say, that hath not swallowed up *Jonah* the prophet, but *Cerinthus* the heretick, and vomited up the condemned opinions of the old hereticks; and chiefly the *Anthropomorphite*, *Sabellians*, *Nestorians*, *Seducens*, *Arabens*, *Tacians* or *Encratite*, *Manichies*,

chies, *Mahumetans* and others: for in holding life eternal to be onely on earth, he is a *Cerinthian* and *Mahumetan*: in giving to God corporiety he is an *Anthropomorphit*, *Manichean*, *Tertullianist* and *Audæan*: in holding the three Persons to be distinct names and essences represented by *Moses*, Christ, and the Apostles, he is a *Sabellian*, *Montanist*, *Aetian*, and *Priscillianist*: in saying, that Christ personated God the Son, he is a *Nestorian* giving him two personalities, for no person can personate himself: id denying spirits he is a *Sadducean*: in making the soul to rest with the body till the re-

sur-

surrection, he is an *Arabian*: in making the soul of man corporeal he is a *Luciferian*: by putting a period to hell torments he is an *Originist*: by teaching dissimulation in religion he is a *Tacian* or *Encratit*: in making God the cause of injustice or sin, he is a *Manichee*: in slighting Christs miracles, he is a *Jew*: and in making our natural reason the word of God, he is *Socinian*: In discovering of these errors, I quarrel not with Mr. *Hobbs*, but with his book; which not onely I, but many more, who are both learned, and judicious, men, look upon as a piece dangerous both to Government

and

and Religion. All the hurt I wish him is, true illumination, a sanctified heart, and Christian sobriety; that he may retract what is amiss. And so I bid him and thee farewel.

A. R.

The

In doctissimum marinæ belluæ domitorem

AL. ROSSEUM.

ALcides clava Lernæum perculit hydram;
Sed tu Ros calamo monstra marina domas.
Quantum Leviathan superavit viribus hydram,
Tantum Ros superas Amphytrioniadem.

D. C.

The Preface.

Being desired by some of my friends a while ago to peruse Mr. Hobbs *his* Leviathan, *and deliver my opinion of it. I have done accordingly; I finde him a man of excellent parts, and in this book much gold, and withal much dross; he hath mingled his wine with too much water, and imbittered his pottage with too much Coloquintida: there are some of his positions which may prove of dangerous consequence, to green heads, and immature judgments, who look no farther then the superficies, or outside of things, thinking all to be gold that glisters, and all wholesome food that is pleasing to the taste; under green grass lurch oftentimes snakes and serpents, such as* Euridice *perceive not, till they be stung to death; I have therefore (not to wrong Mr.* Hobbs, *but to vindicate the truth) (for* in Republica libe-

ra

ra oportet linguas esse liberas) *adventured upon his* Leviathan; *which I do not finde so fierce and terrible as he in* Job, *that people should be cast down at the sight of him; this may be drawn out with a Hook, and held even with a single bridle. I will onely touch such passages, (and not all, but some) as deserve Animadversions, wherein I will be both brief and modest, aiming rather at verity, then victory, though he slights all learned men, as* Iob's Leviathan *doth all humane strength, and prideth himself too much in his scales.*

LEVIATHAN

LEVIATHAN
Drawn out with an HOOK
OR
ANIMADVERSIONS
UPON
Mr HOBB's Book,
Called
LEVIATHAN.

By

ALEXANDER ROSS.

IN His introduction he calls Nature [*The art whereby God hath made and governs the World.*] God made not the world by Nature, for Nature had no beeing till God made it; and when he made it, it was neither the exemplary, nor adjuvant cause of the creation; the world could

not be made by that which had no being till it was made; and when it was made, it was nothing elſe but the form and matter of things; the one being the active, the other the paſſive nature, and both but parts of the univerſe; if again by nature (that we may make a favourable conſtruction of his phraſe) he meaneth the ordinary power of God; the world was not made thus: by his ordinary power he governs it, but by his extraordinary power he made it, which power is never called natural, but miraculous; neither again is *Nature Art*, as he calls it, though both be principles, becauſe Nature is an internal, Art an external principle; I ſay external in reſpect of eſſence, though it may be internal in regard of ſite, albeit Art, as it is an habit, and in the minde of the Artificer is altogether external, but take it for the effect of Art, it may be internal in the thing made by Art; as may be ſeen in the motions of a watch.

He gives us a bad definition of life, when he ſaith: [*Life is but the motion of limbs*] for life is not motion, but the cauſe of motion: there may be life in the limbs when there is no motion, as in ſleep, and in hiſterical women, and there may be motion in the limbs without life, as when they are moved violently by ſome external mover, and there is life where there be no limbs at all, as in the ſoul; and there is motion, where there is no life at all, as in a wooden leg.

Part 1. cap. 1. In the firſt chapter he tells us, [*That the cauſe of ſenſe is the external object, which preſſeth the organ either immediately, as in the taſt and touch, or imediately as in the other ſenſes*] The object indeed is the cauſe both material and efficient of ſenſation, but not of ſenſe; that is, of the act of ſeeing, but not of the faculty, the ſoul is the

the cause of this; neither doth the object press immediately upon the organ of tast or touch, but mediately, for the organ of tast is the nervous part of the tongue, the medium is the spungy flesh, and salival humidity, for the dry tongue tasteth not: the organ of tact is the nerve, the medium is the flesh and skin, called Epidemis. But when he says that [*seeming or fansie is that which men call sense.*] He makes deception and sense one thing, for *quod videtur non est*; what seems to be hath no beeing; therefore in *Euripides*, mad *Orestes* is counselled by his sister to be quiet; because saith she, ὁρᾷς οὐδὲν ὧν δοκεῖς σαφ' εἰδέναι, thou seest none of those things which thou supposeth thou seeth or knowest; sense then is not fancy, for what we fancy we see not, but seem to see, and what we truly see, we fancy not; this the Desciples of Christ knew; (*Mat.* 14.26.) when seeing him walk on the water, they said, it is a fancy, for so it is in the Greek φαντάσμα; that is a sight not real, but imaginary.

When he speaks of the sensible qualities, he mentions among the rest [*colour figured*] but what is that; the thing coloured may be figured, but that colour should have any figure passeth all understanding: nor speaks he like a Philosopher, when he saith that [*all sensible qualities are but several motions*] Then it must follow, that colours, heat, cold, siccity, humidity, *&c.* are motions, but this is to speak against sense as wel as reason, which sheweth motions and colours to be distinct entities; and when he saith that [*motion produceth nothing but motion*] He is deceived for motion produceth heat, neither is motion produced by motion, but by the mover: the motion of heaven was produced by God, not by any antecedent motion. [*The apparence* (saith he) *of the sensible*

qualities to us is fancy, the same waking that dreaming] this is to confound the work of imagination, with that of the outward senses, whereas the outward and inward senses are distinguished both in their organs and operations: Fancy then is the work of the imagination, not of the eye, ear, nose, tongue, or tact, neither can I yeeld that the fancy is the same waking that dreaming, except he means of madmen and fools; but in those whose brains are not crackt, the fancy receiveth its species immediately from the common and outward senses whilest they are awaked, then it worketh orderly, and is regulated by the will; whereas in sleep the fancy receiveth the remainders, and as it were the footsteps of the species from the memory, where they are reserved; so that then the work of imagination is disordred, and no waies guided by the will.

In his second chapter he saith, [*That the Schools ascribe appetite and knowledge to things inanimate absurdly.*] It seems he is not well versed in the Schools; for though they ascribe a natural appetite, or inbred propensity in things inanimate to preserve themselves, yet they ascribe no knowledge to them, but in plain terms affirm, that this appetite is without knowledge: now that there is in things inanimate a natural appetite or inclination, is so far from being absurd, that to affirm the contrary were most absurd: for from whence is it that heavy bodies move downward, light bodies upward, but from this natural appetite and inclination? There would be no generation, if there were not in the matter an appetite to the form; neither could there be motion or action, if there were not an appetite of entities in possibility, to become entities in act. [*Imagination* (saith he) *is nothing but decaying sense,*

Part. 1. cap. 2.

ſenſe, and the ſenſe fading is called memory, ſo that imagination and memory are but one thing.] This is a riddle which *Oedipus* himſelf cannot unriddle: doth the ſtrength of imagination conſiſt in decaying of ſenſe? It muſt follow, that dying men muſt have ſtrongeſt fancies, for then ſenſe decays: but if ſenſe be the generical eſſence of imagination; how can the one increaſe upon the others decay: doubtleſs they like *Hyppocrate*'s twins, live and dye together; ſo that if ſenſe decay, imagination muſt needs decay, for as he confeſſeth, *cap.* 1. [*There is no conception in the minde, which was not at firſt begotten upon the organs of ſenſe*] Now that imagination and memory are not the ſame thing is apparent, by their different organs and operations, the one is in the fore part, the other in the back part of the head, and for the moſt part where the imagination is ſtrongeſt, the memory is weakeſt; and where this is ſtrongeſt that is weakeſt.

In his third chapter he ſaith, [*That things to come have no being at all, the future beeing but a fiction of the mind*] Have future Eclipſes no beeing then? Sure they have as much beeing in the intellect, as paſt Eclipſes in the memory; neither are they meer fictions; for that is properly a fiction which never was, is, nor ſhall be, as Centaures, Chimera's, *&c.* Had the coming of Chriſt no being in the minde of *Abraham*, whereas he ſaw that day and rejoyced? Was the coming of the Meſſias in the fleſh a meer fiction in the mindes and hopes of the Patriarchs and Prophets? Is faith a fiction, or the reſurrection of the fleſh, which is the object of a Chriſtian mans belief, the life of his hope, and the ſupporter of his ſoul in affliction; and doubtleſs in the minde of God all things are preſent, and no fiction at all. Part 1. cap. 3.

I like not his phraſe, when he calls propheſie, gueſſing: for he ſaith, [*That the beſt prophet naturally, is the beſt gueſſer*] gueſſing is conjecturing, but propheſies are certain: did *Iſaiah* onely gueſs when he propheſied that a virgin ſhould conceive and bear a Son? Gods people were in a very ſad and incertain condition, if propheſying were but gueſſing.

He ſaith, [*That it is an abſurd ſpeech, and taken upon credit (without any ſignification at all) from deceived Philoſophers; to wit, that any thing is all in this place, and all in another place at the ſame time.*] Whether is it more abſurd to ſay, that God is all in this great (*All,*) and all in every part; or to ſay, that he is divided into ſo many parcels, as there be places in which he is, ſo that one part of him is in this place, an other in the other place, ſeeing he cannot be all in two places at once: and is it not leſs abſurd to ſay, that all the ſoul is in each member, then to divide the ſoul into ſo many parcels, as there be members.

[*There is no other act* (ſaith he) *of mans minde naturally planted in him, but to be born a man, and to live with the uſe of his five ſenſes.*] To be born a man, is no act, but a paſſion; neither is it at all the act of the minde, but of the man: and to live with the uſe of the five ſenſes, is no more the act of a man, then of a beaſt. And whereas he ſaith, that [*all other faculties are acquired*] He muſt conclude, that the faculties of the underſtanding and will are acquired, and conſequently the ſoul it ſelf; for theſe differ not eſſentially from the ſoul. So when he ſaith, [*There is nothing in the world univerſal but names.*] He will make all predications of univerſalities to be meerly nominal, not real: So that *Peter* is not really a man; nor *Bucephalus* a horſe; nor the *Elme* a tree, but onely in name.

which

which is as much as nothing: ſo all ſciences which handle univerſalities are but nominal, and conſequently no real entities are handled in Metaphyſick, Phyſick, and Mathematick, but bare names, ſeeing theſe ſciences have for their objects univerſalities: So when he makes [*Truth the attribute of ſpeech not of things.*] He excludes all entities, for verity and entity are reciprocal; and it is ridiculous to think there is not truth in things as well as in words, for entity can be no more without truth, then the fire without heat, or the Sun without light. And when he ſaith, that [*Geometry is the only ſcience which God hath beſtowed into man*] He is injurious to Arithmatick, whoſe principles are no leſs certain, firm, indemonſtrable, and evident, then thoſe of *Geometry*.

He envieghs much againſt book learning, but in this he ſpeaks without book, for he calls, in deriſion, ſchool knowledge [*Pedantry.*] Pedantry is that knowledge which is taught to young Scollers; and indeed the beſt books are read to them, and they are inſtructed in the knowledge of the beſt things, both in divine and humane literature: being fit that new veſſels be ſeaſoned with the beſt liquor. *Quo ſemel eſt imbuta*, &c. So the precepts of divinity and philoſophy to this profound Rabbi, whoſe learning paſſeth all underſtanding, are but Pedantry; but in ſpeaking againſt the Schools, he ſouls his own neſt: for whence had he the knowledge which he now rejects, but out of them; as for his own ſuppoſed learning which he hath without them, it is ſuch, as will never be thought worthy to be called Pedantry, nor ſhall it ever be honoured to be taught in Schools; nor ſhall *Ariſtotle*, *Plato*, *Cicero*, *Thomas*, and other eminent men need to fear leſt Mr. *Hobbs*'s whimſies and

Part 1. cap. 3. 4.

dreams, thrust their solid and grave learning out of doors.

Part 1. cap. 5. He accounteth these subsequent assertions, absurd; namely, [*That faith is infused or inspired, when nothing can be poured or breathed into any thing but body, and that extention is body*, &c.] I would know how faith being a gift from without, and not born with us, should enter into us? If not by inspiration or infusion? And if nothing can be poured or breathed but body; then it must follow that *Adam*'s soul was a body, for it was breathed into *Adam*; and that the Holy Ghost is a body, for he is said to be poured upon all flesh by the prophets, *Joel* and *Zachariah*: but if by the spirit be understood spiritual vertues or graces, then in Mr. *Hobbs* his judgment this will be counted an absurd assertion; but I hope he hath more Religion in him, then to think the Holy Scripture speaks absurdly; neither is there any absurdity in calling extension a body, seeing not a substantial, but a mathematical body is meant, to distinguish it from superficies and line.

He [*will not have colour to be in the body, nor sound in the air.*] Where then is colour? which is its subject? is it in a spirit? I know no other subject in which it can be inherent, except one of these two: If there be any there, name it; and if sound be not in the air, how come we to hear it. He should do well to prove his new assertions, as wel as to deny the old: so he holds it absurd to say, [*That a living creature is a genus, or general thing*] But the contrary is plain, for this proposition [*man is a living creature*] were absurd, because identical, if living creature were not a general, but a particular thing; it must also follow that a horse were not a living creature, or that a man and a horse were the

the ſame particular thing, ſeeing he admits of no general thing: any one may ſee here, whether the ancient and wiſe Philoſophers, or this new Miſoſopher be moſt guilty of abſurdities; neither is it abſurd to ſay, [*That the nature of a thing is its definition.*] Seeing man, the thing defined, is the ſame with rational creature which is his definition. Nor is there abſurdity in this ſpeech, [*Mans command is his will.*] ſeeing there is no other commanding faculty in man but his will; neither are Metaphors, Tropes, and other Rhetorical figures abſurd ſpeeches; except he will accuſe the Holy Ghoſt of abſurdity, who uſeth them ſo frequently in ſcripture: and if theſe words, [*Hypoſtatical, Tranſubſtantiate,* &c.] be abſurd words, let him impart better, and more ſignificant terms, and we ſhall think him, though not a good Philoſopher, yet a good Grammarian.

In his ſixth chapter he makes [*animal and voluntary motion the ſame;*] but abſurdly, for the motion of ſpirits is voluntary, not animal; and the motion of men in their ſleep is animal, not voluntary; for many in their ſleep ſpeak thoſe words, and perform thoſe actions, of which they are both aſhamed and afraid when they are awakened: if to ſpeak were an animal motion, as he ſaith, then beaſts could ſpeak for they are animals. He ſaith [*That which we neither deſire nor hate, we are ſaid to contemn.*] But this is not ſo, for I neither deſire nor hate the Kingdom of *Perſia*, and yet I contemn it not; whatſoever I hate, I contemn, but I contemn many things which I hate not. Part 1. cap. 6.

When he diſtinguiſheth Religion from Superſtition I hear the voice of *Leviathan*, not of a Chriſtian; For, ſaith he, [*Fear of power inviſible, feigned by the mynde, or from tales publickly allowed is Religion,*

ligion, not allowed Superſtition, and when the power imagined is truly ſuch as we imagine, true Religion.] It ſeems then both Religion and Superſtition are grounded upon tales and imagination, onely they differ in this, that tales publickly allowed beget Religion, not allowed Superſtition: but what will he ſay of the Gentiles, among them tales were publickly allowed, were they therefore religious, and not ſuperſtitious; and is Religion grounded upon fiction or imagination, even true Religion? I thought that faith and not imagination had been the ſubſtance and ground of things not ſeen; that the juſt live by faith, not by imagination, that by faith we are ſaved; by faith we are juſtified; by faith we overcom the world; not by fancy, fiction, or imagination: We muſt mend the Creed, if Mr. *Hobbs* his religion be true; and inſteed of ſaying I beleeve in God, we muſt ſay, I imagine, or feign in my minde an inviſible power. In this alſo he contradicts himſelf, for if the power be inviſible, how can it be imagined, ſeeing (as he ſaith before) imagination [*is onely of things perceived by the ſenſe, and it is ſo called from the image made in ſeeing.*

He will not have the will to be [*a rational appetite, becauſe then there could be no voluntary acts againſt reaſon.*] But the School doctrine ſtands firm, that the will is a rational apperite, and that there can be no voluntary acts againſt reaſon, becauſe the object of the will is a known good; for we cannot will or affect what we know not, and knowledge in man is never without reaſon, which regulates the will; beſides each man in willing, aimes at an end which cannot be attained without its medium, nor this ordered without reaſon, either true or apparent. (*Part* 1. *cap.* 7.) He ſeems to make faith and opinion the ſame thing,

when

when he saith, [*That in belief are two opinions, one of the saying of the man, the other of his vertue*] but in this he makes the Christian mans happiness very incertain, and builds it upon a tottering foundation, for opinion is meerly conjectural, and of probabilities onely; whereas faith makes its object certain, and withal he makes these phrases the same; [*To have faith in, to trust to, and to beleeve a man*] but Saint *Austin* and the Church ever since have made these distinct phrases; for *credere Deo*, is to beleeve that God is true; *credere Deum*, is to beleeve there is a God, which wicked men and evil Angels may do; but *credere in Deum* is to love God, and to relie on him, and to put our trust in him, which none do but good men; therefore Mr. *Hobbs* is injurious to Christianity, when he saith, [*That to beleeve in God, as it is in the Creed is meant not trust in the person, but confession of the doctrine.*] If so, then the Devil may as boldly, and with as great comfort say the Creed, as any Christian; for he beleeves and trembles, saith Saint *James*, and we know these evil spirits confessed Christ to be the Son of God: and he is no less injurious to God, when he will have us beleeve in the Church, saying, [*Our belief, faith, and trust is in the Church, whose words we take, and acquiesce therein*] but the Apostles in their Creed have taught us otherwise, namely, That we beleeve the Catholick Church; but we beleeve in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, and in the H. Ly Ghost.

He makes Devils, Demoniacks, and Mad-men to signifie in Scripture the same thing; for thus he writes; [*Where as many of those Devils are said to confess Christ; Is it not necessary to interpret those places otherwise, then that those mad-men confessed him.*] And shortly after.

Part 1. cap. 3.

ter. [*I see nothing at all in the Scripture that requires a belief, that Demoniacks were any other thing but mad-men.*] Yes, there be divers things that make it necessary for him to beleeve, that these were distinct. 1. The letter of the text, from which we should not digress, except we were urged by an inconvenience, which is not here. 2. The Authority of the Church, in which he saith he doth beleeve. Now the Church alwaies took these for distinct creatures; to wit, Devils, Demoniacks, and Mad-men. 3. The honour of Christ; for wherein was the power of his Divinity seen, if these were ordinary Mad-men, seeing madness is curable by physick, and every common Physitian. It tended more to Christ's honour, that the Devil, whose Kingdom he came to destroy, should confess, his divinity, then that mad-men should acknowledge it. 4. Christ came to call Jews and Gentiles by working of miracles; but to cast out Devils, and to cure Demoniacks was a greater miracle then to cure mad-men. 5. The New Testament distinguisheth Demoniacks from madmen; for these are called Demoniacks, not mad, and Saint *Paul* is termed mad by the Athenians, and not a Demoniack: so Devils are never called mad-men in Scripture, nor madmen called Devils: besides, as all mad-men are not Demoniacks, so all Demoniacks are not mad-men; for the Devil entered into *Judas* Iscariot, he became a demoniack, or possessed by the Devil, and yet he was no mad-man: but, *I* doubt me, Mr. *Hobbs* is mad himself, in thinking all learned men to be mad except himself; he thinks the School-men mad, because their terms cannot be translated, or are not intelligible in vulgar languages; by this he may as well ascribe madness to Lawyers, and Physitians, as to Divines, for their terms of Art cannot be well translated, nor can vulgar capacities

pacities eaſily underſtand them, nor is it much material whether they do or not; Church and State can ſubſiſt well enough, though the vulgar ſort underſtand not the terms of School divinity; & if theſe terms are not intelligible by dull heads and ſhallow brains; the fault is in themſelves, not in the terms; for *quicquid recipitur ad modum recipientis recipitur, non ad modum recepti*, Blinde men muſt not accuſe the Sun of obſcurity, becauſe they cannot ſee him; neither are the words of *Suarez*, which he alledgeth for an example, ſo obſcure as he would make them, for to an intelligent man the words are very plain: to wit, [That the firſt cauſe hath no neceſſary influence upon the ſecond, by reaſon of ſubordination, which is a help to their working] Here be two things remarkable. 1. That the ſecond cauſes work by reaſon of ſubordination to the firſt cauſe. 2. That the firſt cauſe worketh not neceſſarily upon the ſecond, but voluntarily. If this diſh pleaſe not Mr. *Hobbs* his pallat; he muſt blame his mouth which is out of taſt, and not the meat which is both wholeſom and savory.

In his tenth chapter he uttereth ſtrange Paradoxes. [1. *That to pitty is to diſhonour.* 2. *That good Fortune, if laſting, is a ſign of Gods favour.* 3. *That courteouſneſs of great riches, and ambition of great honours are honourable.* 4. *That an unjuſt action, ſo it be joyned with power; is honorable, for honour conſiſteth onely in the opinion of power; therefore the heathen gods are honoured by the Poets for their theefts and adulteries: and at firſt among men, piracy and theft were counted no diſhonour.*] 1. Pitty is rather honour then diſhonour; for when a father pitteth his child, a King his ſubject, or a Maſter his ſervant, do they diſhonour them. When we deſire God to pitty us, do we deſire him to diſhonour us? him whom Part 1. cap. 10.

we

we dishonour we pitty not, and whom we pitty we dishonour not; pitty proceeds of love dishonour of hatred. 2. If lasting good fortune be a sign of Gods favour, it seems then that the Turks are highly in Gods favour, for their good fortune hath continued these many hundreth years. Whether was poor and starved *Lazarus*, or that rich glutton, who fared dilitiously every day, highest in Gods favour. 3. Who ever afore Mr. *Hobbs* made ambition honourable, and covetousness, which Saint *Paul* calls the root of all evil. Can sin be honorable, which brought shame and dishonour upon mankinde; in respect of sin, man did not abide in honour, but became like the beasts that perish. If ambition of great honors be honorable, then were the evil Angels and *Adam* most honorable, when they affected to be like God himself, which is the greatest and highest honour that can be: then were *Caligula*, *Domitian*, *Heliogabalus*, and others who affected divine honours, most honorable. *Midas* coveted great riches when he wished all might be gold he touched, therefore in this he was most honorable: but if it be honour to offend God, to transgress his law, to incur his displeasure, and suffer eternal pains; let them who like injoy this honour, I will have none of it; *non equidem tali me dignor honore*. 4. He makes [*unjust actions joyned with power honourable*.] Then unjust actions without power deserve no honour; it is even as *Seneca* complaineth in his time, *parva furta puniuntur, magna in triumphis aguntur*. Petty theeves are hanged, but great robberies are honoured. He spoke it with grief, when a cruel tyrant ruled, or rather misruled the Empire. But otherwaies, where there is government, unjust actions are punished, nor honoured; and if it were not so,

Kingdoms

Kingdoms would be nothing else but dens of theeves, *remota justitia quid aliud sunt regna, quam magna latrocinia.* All principalities would be tyrannies; and indeed where there is greatest power, there should be most justice; if Princes will be like God, who is *optimus maximus*, in whom greatness and goodness have met together; to whom much power is given, of him much justice is required, *in maxima fortuna minima licentia est.* It is abominable then to make injustice with power honorable; for honour is the reward of vertue: was *Achab's* unjust seasing of *Naboths* Vinyard honorable? Or are the actions of highway robbers, armed with power, to be honoured? Sure, not in any Christian Common-wealth where *Themis* raigns, and *Astrea* hath not again forsaken the earth; but perhaps injustice may sit as a Queen, and be honorable in *Leviathan's* Republick. [*Ubi prosperum ac felix scelus virtus vocatur, sontibus parent boni. Jus est in armis opprimit leges timor.*] There honour may consist according to Mr. *Hobbs* his doctrine, in the opinion onely of power, without respect had to vertue and goodness; and so because the evil Angels are called principalities and powers, they deserve most honour. But in other Common-wealths were *Leviathan* raigns not, I finde that goodness is as much honoured as greatness; piety, justice, temperance, prudence, learning, and other endowments, are had in no less honour then the greatest power that is. *Demetrius Phalereus* had more statues (to wit, 306.) at *Athens* erected to him for his eloquence, then ever any of their most powerful Commanders for their greatness: the Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and other eminent men, are honored at this day for their goodness, not for greatness. *Homer, Aristotle, Virgil, Cicero,* are in esteem for their learning, not for their

power.

power: and with me *Diogines* in his tub, is in greater honour, then *Alexander* in his throne. We honour God not so much for his greatness, (for so the Devil honours him) as for his goodness; and the child honoreth his parents, not out of fear of their greatness, as out of love to their goodness. Honor then doth not meerly consist in the opinion of power: As for the Poets, commending their Gods for their thefts and adulteries, and some barbarous Gentiles honouring theft and piracy: I must confess that Mr. *Hobbs* is here reduced to hard shifts, for supporting his irreligious Paradox, or Caeodox rather; for by the same means he may maintain that honour is due to Garlick, Onyons, Crocodiles, Dogs, Cats, &c. because the Egyptians worshiped these. What wonder is it, if theeves and Pirats honour each other; but the civilised Gentiles were so far from honouring theft and piracy, that they made severe lawes against theft, and inflicted condign punishment upon the guilty: As for the Poets commending the thefts and adulteries of their gods, they are not to be understood literally but mystically, as I have shewed elsewhere, in *Mystagog. Poetico.*

In his eleventh chapter, he tells us, Part 1. cap. 11. [*That felicity is a continual progress of the desire, from one object to another*] desire is an inclination of the will, to obtain the good things we want, or to be rid of the evil with which we are oppressed: but in neither of these consisteth felicity; for he cannot be happy which wants the good which should satisfie him, or is possessed of the evil which oppresseth him: in heaven onely is true felicity, because as Saint *Austin* saith, we shall desire nothing that is absent: if desire be happiness, then is the covetous man most happy,

for

for he is ſtill deſiring more wealth. In true happineſs, there is love, but neither faith nor hope, which are the companions of deſire: beſides, he makes man in worſe condition then the beaſts; for he ſaith in his twelfth chapter, [*That the felicity of beaſts conſiſteth in the injoying of their quotidian food.*] And yet mans happineſs conſiſteth onely in deſire, which is againſt ſenſe and reaſon, for a hungry man cannot be happy in deſiring, but in injoying of food: it is not therefore the fight, nor deſire but the injoyment of the object which will make us happy, *Mars videt hanc, viſámque cupit, poſcitque cupita.*

In his twelf chapter he ſaith, [*That many revolted from the Church of* Rome, *becauſe the Schoolmen brought in Philoſophy, and* Ariſtotles *doctrine into Religion; whence aroſe contradictions and abſurdities, as brought the Clergy into a reputation of ignorance.*] It is ſtrange that Philoſophy ſhould make the Clergy reputed ignorant, whereas it contains the knowledge both of divine and humane things: and it is one of the chief bleſſings of Almighty God, beſtowed upon mankinde, by which his image loſt in *Adam* is repaired; for the underſtanding is enlightned by the ſpeculative, and the will is regulated by the practical parts thereof: and Philoſophy is ſo far from cauſing peoples revolt from that Church; that on the contrary, it is one of the main ſupporters and pillars thereof: I am afraid that it was not Philoſophy which brought a repuration of ignorance upon that Church, but rather their want of it, which alſo will occaſion much ignorance, ſtupidity, and darkneſs in our Church: And I pray you good Mr. *Hobbs*, what hurt hath Divinity received from Philoſophy, or *Ariſtotles* doctrine. Hath it cauſed contradictions, and abſurdities

Part. 1. cap. 12.

absurdities; (as you say) sure, you are widely mistaken: for by Philosophy contradictions and absurdities are avoided, into which those ignorant souls do fall, who want it, as we finde at this time by woful experience, there being more absurd and contradictory opinions among the people of this Nation, now, in a few years since *Aristotles* doctrine hath been discouraged, then were all the time hitherto since Christianity was imbraced. And what wonder is it if they that walk in darkness stumble: How should we come to know the heavens, the earth, the seas, the fire, the air, the beasts, fishes, and fowls, the hearbs, trees, plants, pretious stones, all which physical bodies, with divers others are mentioned in Scripture: besides, Spirits, Angels, and other Metaphysical entities: without Philosophy, how should we define, divide, dispute, speak or write methodically or syllogistically without this. I will say nothing of the benefit we receive by moral, political, and oeconomical Physlosophy: How shall we dispute against Heretieks, and refel their subtil arguments without it. *Justin Martyr*, and many other Greek and Latin Fathers, fought against the Gentles, Jews, and Hereticks, with this sword, and beat them with their own weapons; therefore to condemn Philosophy, is to condemn the minister and handmaid of divinity; between which there can be no more repugnancy, then there is between the principal and subordinate cause, between two lights, two truths, or between the body and the soul.

Part. 1. cap. 15. In his fifteenth chapter, [*He will have all men equal by nature, and that* Aristotle *was mistaken, in saying, that wise men were more fit to command, and that others whose bodies are strong,*

ſtrong, and judgments weake, fitter to ſerve: This (he ſaith) *is againſt reaſon and experience; for there are few ſo fooliſh, that had not rather govern themſelves, then be governed.*

Anſw. Though all men be equal by nature, in regard of the eſſential perfection of the ſoul, yet, in reſpect of accidental perfections, we finde the contrary; for ſome are by nature blind, ſome deaf, ſome dumb, ſome lame and deformed, ſome dull, fooliſh and ſtupid. I would know then, whether a fool whoſe body is ſtrong & judgment weak be naturally apter to command, or to ſerve? And whether he who is of a weak body, and of a ſtrong judgment, is not fitted by nature rather to command then to ſerve? Mr. *Hobbs* ſaith, [*That there are few ſo fooliſh, which had not rather govern themſelves, then be governed.*] But I ſay that whoſoever is not fit for government, is a notorious fool, if he will rather govern then be governed, let him think what he will. Had *Phaeton* been a wiſe man, he would not have affected the government of his fathers charriot: *Magna petis Phaeton, & quæ non viribus illis munera conveniunt.* On the contrary, wiſe men have choſen rather to be governed by others, then to govern others; and Chriſt, the wiſdom of the Father, would rather be a ſervant then a King. Doubtleſs, in the ſtate of innocency, there ſhould have been naturally a ſubordination and ſubjection, as of children to their parents, of wives to their husbands, and of inferiours to their ſuperiours; for there ſhould have been no more equality then among men, on earth, than there was, and is in heaven among Angels, and in hell among Devils; yea, there is naturally ſubjection among beaſts, *rex unus apibus, dux unus gregibus.* To ſay then that there is no inequality by nature, is to ſay, that there is no order

order in nature which cannot be without ſubordination; ſurely, in the ſtate of corrupted nature, to ſay that all are equal, is to ſay, that none have ſinned, for ſin brought in ſervitude and ſubjection, ſo that the effect is no leſs natural then the cauſe. Again, whatſoever is neceſſary, is alſo natural; but inequality and ſubordination among men, who will live together is neceſſary, and therefore natural; we ſee alſo, that the body is naturally ſubject and ſubordinate to the ſoul; *animæ imperio, corporis ſervitio utimur.* To be brief, ſeeing among men, there are many defects and imperfections, wants and infirmities, and that naturally; there muſt be alſo naturally an inequality and ſubjection, by which theſe defects may be ſupplyed; which could not be if all men were equal by nature: Therefore, not *Ariſtotle*, but Mr. *Hobbs* ſpeaks againſt reaſon and experience.

Part 1. cap. 16. I like not his phraſe, when he ſaith, [*That God was perſonated firſt by* Moſes, *then by Chriſt the Son of man.*] For they that differ in perſonality may perſononate each other, but Chriſt the Son of man differs not in perſonality from God, ſeeing in him the divinity, and humanity make up but one perſon; and though the Father and Son in the Trinity are diſtinct perſons; yet the Son cannot perſonate the Father; becauſe their nature is numerically one and the ſame; neither is it true what he ſaith, concerning covenants, *Part* 2. *cap.* 18. [*That they are but words and breath, and have no force to oblige but from the ſword.*] For covenants are real conſents of two or more perſons, now conſent is an act of the ſoul, and not a bare word or breath; the words that are uttered, are but the ſymbols and ſignes of the mind; there be alſo many mental, and imply-

ed

ed or tacite covenants made without words; and many covenants that have no dependance on the ſword; as thoſe that are made between God and man. *Abraham* and *Noah* had been but in a bad condition, if the covenants that God made with them had been but bare words and breath.

When he ſaith, [*That whatſoever the Prince doth, can be no injury to the ſubject, nor ought he to be accuſed by any of them of injuſtice; for he that doth any thing by authority from another, doth therein no injury to him by whoſe authority he acteth.*] This doctrine will hardly down with free born people, who chooſe to themſelves Princes, not to tyranniſe over them, but like good ſhepherds, or fathers of their Country, to rule them; the people were not mad to give their power ſo to Princes, as to be their ſlaves; or to think that tyrannical cruelties and oppreſſions are not injuries to the ſubject, or that tyrants muſt not be accuſed of injuſtice, for although the Prince acteth by the peoples authority in things lawful, yet in his lawleſs exorbitancies, he acteth by his own tyranniſing power, not by the peoples authority; for they be authors of his lawful power, yet they are no waies authors of his exorbitancies: and it is ridiculous when he ſaith, [*No man can do injury to himſelf, and that the Prince may commit iniquity but not injuſtice or injury.*] For its too apparent, that moſt men are too injurious to themſelves, *nemo læditur niſi à ſeipſo*, O, *Iſrael*, thy deſtruction is of thy ſelf: And I would fain know what true difference there is between injuſtice and iniquity, or injury, for *jus* and *æquum* ſignifie the ſame thing in latine, whence we borrow the words *injuſtice*, *injury*, *iniquity*: I know ſome put a difference between *jus* and *æquum*, but to little purpoſe; for doubtleſs, every injury is unjuſt, Part 2. cap. 18.

just, and each unjust act is an injury, and an iniquity either against God or man; he is also injurious to good Princes, when he makes no difference between them and tyrants, *Part* 2. *cap.* 20. [*between despotical and paternal dominions, making tyrants and Soveraigns by institution all one in rights and consequences.*] This is to put no difference between the Father and Butcher of his Country, between the Shepherd and the woolf, between sharing and fleaing of the sheep. A King governs, and is governed by laws; a tyrant hath no law but his will; *jus est in armis, opprimit leges timor.* This his absurd assertion he would patronise by Scripture, which describeth to us, 1 *Sam.* 8. 11, 12, *verses*, the manner of Kings; namely, to take your sons and daughters to drive his charriot, *&c.* To take your fields and Vinyards, *&c.* But in that he mistakes himself; for in that chapter the Scriptures describes unto us, not the qualities of Kings, but of tyrants, such as the neighbouring Nations had, which dwelt about *Judea*: but if he will see the qualities of a good King, and such as the Lord would chose; let him read the 17. chapter of *Deuteronomy*, there he shall finde a King that must be regulated by the law of God, and not by his own will.

Part 2. cap. 21. So in his twenty one chapter, he will make us beleeve, that *David* did no injury to *Uriah*, When he killed him; [*because the right to do what he pleased, was given him by* Uriah *himself, but the injury was done to God, who prohibited all iniquity; which distinction* David *confirmed, when he saith, to thee onely have I sinned.*] He may as well say, that the right to do what *David* pleased was given him by God, and therefore no injury in killing *Uriah* was offered to God, which contradicts his assertion, but indeed neither assertion

tion is true, for neither God nor *Uriah* gave right to *David*, to do what he pleased, to say that God gives to sinful men right to act what they please, is to make God the author of sin; and to say that *Uriah* gave right to *David* to kill him, is to make him accessary to his own murther: And to say, that a Tyrant doth not wronge the innocent, when he murthers him causlesly, is to put no difference between an unjust Tyrant, and a just Judge, when he executes a Malefactor deservingly: now when *David* saith, *To thee only have I sinned*: he speaketh so, because God onely knew his intention, that he meant to murther *Uriah*: when he placed him in the forefront of the army.

He saith, [*That whether a Common-weath be monarchical or popular, the freedom is still the same*] This I deny, for in an absolute monarchy there is no liberty but meer slavery; such is the condition of those who live under the Turk, the *Muscovit*, *Prester John*: and the *Magol*; in other governments there is more or less liberty, according to the condition of the times, and people, and the disposition of the Governors; for there was more liberty under *Augustus*, *Titus*, *Antoninus*, *Aurelius*, and other Monarchs then under many Popular States; *Fallitur egregio quisquis sub principe credit servitium; nunquam libertas gratior extat quam sub rege pio.* And under Democracy there is at some times more liberty then at others; to say then, that the freedom under a Monarchy and Popular government is the same, is as much, as if I should say, a child is as free under a rigid and cruel Schoolmaster, as under an indulgent Mother: Where there is continual fear, there can be no liberty; and such is the condition of those that live under Tyrants. Part 2. cap. 21.

He

Part. 1. cap. 21. He slights *Aristotle*'s opinion concerning Democracy, for saying there is more liberty there, then in any other government; yet he refels none of *Aristotle*'s reasons: which are these. 1. In Democracy all the Citizens have a vote in choſing of their Magistrates. 2: All have a right to govern as well as to be governed. 3. Magistrates, for the moſt part, are choſen by lot, rather then by ſuffrages. 4. They are not choſen for their wealth. 5. Nor is the ſame man choſen often into the Supreme Office. 6. Nor may he ſtay too long in his Office. 7. That Judges are choſen out of all degrees and orders of the people. 8. That the Supreme Senate, which is choſen out of all the people, hath the chief authority over the Commonwealth. 9: That publick officers have their allowance and maintenance. 10. That the meaneſt trades of the people are not excluded from publick offices and honours. 11. By often changing of Supreme officers, way is made for the advancing of many, and occaſion of abuſing the Supreme power is taken away. For theſe reaſons *Aristotle* held there was nnder Democracy more liberty, then under Monarchy.

Part 2. cap. 28. In his twenty eight chapter he tels us, [*That the Subject did not give to the Soveraign the right of puniſhing, and that this right is not grounded on any conceſſion or gift of the Subjects.*] Theſe words are plainly contradictory to what he ſaid before, *cap.* 28. Namely, [*That the Subject is the author of all the actions and judgments of the Soveraign*] And again, [*Every particular man is author of all the Soveraign doth; and conſequently he that complaineth of injury from his Soveraign, complaineth of that whereof he himſelf is author; and therefore* David *had right to do what he pleaſed,*

given

given him by Uriah; *for which cauſe he did* Uriah *no injury to kill him*] Here is a plain contradiction. The ſubject giveth right to the Prince to do what he pleaſeth, even to murther him; and yet giveth no power to puniſh him. Is it likely that any ſubject, is ſo mad, as to covenant with his Prince, that he ſhall have right to murther him, without cauſe? and yet when he hath juſt cauſe, he ſhall have no power to puniſh him.

Chap. 28. He ſaith, [*That mans pride compelled him to ſubmit himſelf to Government*] This is a Paradox; for mans pride made him rebel againſt Government, but not ſubmit to it. Before man grew proud, he ſubmitted himſelf to be governed by God, ſo did the Apoſtate Angels; but their pride made them affect equality with God, and conſequently, rebel, and refuſe to obey and to be governed: it is not pride then, but humility, that makes man ſubmit to government: For pride loves to be ſtill uppermoſt, as the word ſheweth, *ſuperbire quaſi ſuperire*, So proud *Atreus* in *Seneca*, (*Theſ. Act.* 5.) *Equalis aſtris gradior & cunctos ſuper, altum ſuperbo vertice attingens polum*: ſo the proud man, by the Pſalmiſt is compared to a high Cedar in *Lebanus*, and proud *Nebuchadnezar*, in *Daniel*, to an exceeding tall tree, whoſe top reached to Heaven. *Lucifer* in *Iſay* 14. 14. ſaith, *I will aſſend above the hight of the clouds, I will be like the moſt High.* We know that pride hath been the cauſe of ſo much troubles and wars in the world, becauſe proud men will not ſubmit to government: *nec ferre poteſt Cæſarve priorem, Pompeiúſve parem*; *Cæſar* will not ſubmit to be governed by *Pompey*, nor *Pompey* by *Cæſar*: Mr. *Hobbs* might have obſerved this in the naming of *Leviathan*, which he alledgeth; for as *Job* ſaith, he ſeeth every high thing below him,

and is King of all the children of pride: and so he acknowledgeth himself, in the beginning of the next chapter, that men for want of humility will not suffer the rude and combersom points of their present greatness to be taken off.

In his twenty ninth chapter, amongst the diseases of a Common-wealth, which he saith proceed from the poyson of seditious doctrines, he reckons this for one, [*That whatsoever a man doth against his conscience is sin.*] The Christian schools and pulpits never held this, for a disease or seditious doctrine till now; I believe Mr. *Hobbs* his doctrine is rather seditious, for if it be no sin to act against the conscience, people may rebel when they please without sin, though they know that rebellion is against the conscience; for the Apostle tels us, that we must be subject to the higher powers, not onely for wrath, but also for conscience sake: *Rom.* 13. 5. It is the curb of conscience that restrains men from rebellion, there is no outward force or law so powerful, as that inward law of the conscience; no castle so impregnable as this; *hic murus abaneus esto.* There is no Judge so severe; no Torturer so cruel, as an accusing conscience; this *Saul*, *Judas*, *Orestes*, and too many more knew, who would rather be their own executioners, then endure the continual tortures, and be tormented with the fire-brands of those snaky hared Furies, whose residence is in an evil conscience. Hear what a Heathen can say in this case—

Part. 2. cap. 29.

Juvenal. Sat. 13.

———*cur tamen hos tu*
Evasisse putes: quos diri conscia facti,
Mens habet attonitos, & cæco verbere pulsat
Occultum quatiente animum tortore flagellum?

Pœna

Pœna autem vehemens, ac multo sævior illis
Quas & Gedinius gravis invenit aut Rhadamanthus:
Nocte dieque suum gestare in pectore testem.

To the same purpose, Persius. Pers. Sat. 3.

Anne magis Siculi gemuerunt æra juvenci,
Aut magis auratis pendens laquearibus ensis;
Purpureas subter cervices terruit; imus,
Imus præcipites, quam si sibi dicat & intus
Palleat infelix, quid proxima nescia uxor.

He then that can act against his conscience without sin, or remorse; is one of those the Apostle speakes of, whose conscience is seared with a hot iron: and he must needs be miserable, that despiseth the testimony of this witness, saith *Seneca*. The Apostle who was no teacher of sedition, assures us that they shall not escape the judgment of God, who do the same things they condemn in others, *Rom.* 2. 3. that is who act against their conscience; and saith plainly, that to him who esteemeth any thing unclean, to him it is unclean, *Rom.* 14. 14. Therefore that which is no sin in it self, may be sin to him whose conscience saith it is sin. Hence the Schooles teach us, that he who acts against an erroneous conscience sinneth, for by this he is convinced that he hath a will to sin, and that he can sin deliberately. Besides, he that acteth against his conscience, acteth against the law of God, to which he thinks his conscience conformable. St. *Paul* pleadeth before the Councel, *Acts* 23. 1. That he had lived in all good conscience; and in this testimony of his conscience was his rejoycing, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. and wisheth *Timothy* to hold faith and a good conscience, which some putting away, that is, acting against it, concerning faith have made shipwrack. 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. and in the same chapter sheweth,

that the end of the commandment is love, out of a pure heart, a good conſcience, and faith unfained; for theſe three are inſeparable companions: now whereas Mr. *Hobbs* ſaith, [*That this doctrine dependeth on the preſumption of him who makes himſelf judge of good and evil.*] I ſay it is no preſumption, but a duty impoſed on every man to judge of good and evil, ſeeing he hath both the light of nature, and of Scripture to direct him; and the Apoſtle ſheweth, [that the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, theſe having not the law, are a law to themſelves, which ſhew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conſcience bearing witneſs, and their thoughts excuſing or elſe accuſing each other, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15.]

Chapter 29. He will not have faith [*to be attained by inſpiration or infuſion, but by ſtudy, and reaſon.*] and ſhortly after he ſaith, [*That faith is no miracle, but brought to paſs by education, diſcipline, correction, and other natural waies*, &c.] That *Peters* faith was not revealed to him by fleſh and blood, but by the Father of Chriſt who is in Heaven is plain by our Saviours own words, *Mat.* 16. 16. And he thanks his heavenly Father for hiding the myſteries of faith from the prudent, and and revealing them to babes, *Mat* 11. 25. For if faith comes by ſtudy, reaſon, diſcipline, and education, doubtleſs the wiſe Philoſophers, and not the ignorant Fiſhers had beleeved in Chriſt; but we find it otherwaies: that not many learned (as the Apoſtle ſaith) not many wiſe, but God hath choſen the fools and ignorants of this world to confound the wiſe and learned; and ſo Chriſt ſaith, That none can come to him except the Father draw him, *John* 16. And St. *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* 12. God hath diſtributed to every man the meaſure

measure of faith, and confesseth that he obtained this mercy of God, to be faithful, 1 *Cor.* 7. And he saith, that we are saved by grace through faith, not of our selves; it is the gift of God, *Eph.* 2. 8. And indeed if faith came by reason or study, we may by study attain salvation, justification, and life eternal; for the Scripture tells us, That we are saved by faith, and by faith we are justified, and the just live by faith, and that this hath been the constant doctrine of the Church from the beginning, is plain to be seen in the writings of the Fathers, general and provincial Councels. Now whereas he saith, [*That faith is no miracle.*] I say it is a miracle, in that it is a supernatural gift, so inconsistent with natural reason, that a holy and ancient Father said, there were three miracles in Christs Incarnation; to wit, the union of the divinity and humanity. 2. Of maternity and virginity. 3. Of faith and the heart of man; but he cannot see [*Why any man should render a reason of his faith, or why every Christian should not be also a prophet, or why any man should take the law of his Country, rather then his own inspiration, for the rule of his action*] None of these inconveniences will follow, though faith come by inspiration: For 1. why may not any man give a reason, that is, render an account as well of an inspired, as of an acquired faith: St. *Paul* was inspired, and yet he gives an account of his faith to the Jewes, *Acts* 22. and to *Agrippa*, *Acts* 26. 2. What necessity is there, that every Christian should be a prophet, who hath an inspired faith? Is faith and prophesie one and the same gift, *Balaam* could prophesie and yet was no beleever; and many in the Primitive Church, beleeved, and yet could not prophesie. Nor 3ly, is there any reason why he who is inspired should refuse to be-

ruled by the law of his Country, except that law be repugnant to the true faith with which he is inspired; for Christ and his Apostles rejected not the civil law of the Romans, but were in outward things ruled by it; though they were inspired. Hence then it appears that these truths are not pernicious opinions, nor do they proceed from the tongues and pens of unlearned Divines, as Mr. *Hobbs* saith, but they are manifest truths, held by the most learned Doctors of the Church in all ages.

Chap. 29. He [*will not have the Soveraign to be subject to his own laws, because then he should be subject to himself, and to set the laws above the Soveraign, were to set a Judge above him*, &c.] If a man can subdue himself, he must be subject to himself, and as there is no conquest so honorable, so there is no subjection so profitable as this, *Fortior est qui se quam qui fortissima vincit menia*, *Cicero* tells *Cæsar* that he had subdued many fierce Nations, and conquered divers potent Kingdoms, but in restoring of *Marcellus* he had overcom himself, which was a conquest, that made him not like the most excellent men, but rather like to God himself. *Latius regnes avidum domando spiritum quam si Lybiam remotis Gadibus jungas*, &c. What availed it *Alexander* to conquer the world and not to conquer himself; to be a slave to his vices, and not subject to his laws. And I pray, why should not a Prince be as well subject to his own laws, as to his oaths, covenants, and promises; there is nothing so honorable for a King, as to keep his word, and to observe the laws, which he not onely made, but by oath and promise tied himself to obey. And surely this is the very law of nature, which as Mr. *Hobbs* saith, [*is divine, and cannot by any man or common-wealth be abrogated.*] Neither is

there

there any inconvenience to ſet the law as a Judge above the Prince; for as *Ariſtotle* tells us, *Polit. l.* 3. c. 11. The law where it is plain and perſpicuous ought to bear rule, because without it no King nor Common-wealth can govern. And ſecondly, Because the law is juſt, not ſubject to partiality, paſſion and affection, as Princes and other men are; and indeed Princes ſhould be ſo far from diſobeying their own laws, that they ſhould be the life and ſoul of the law, which of itſelf is but a dead letter, therefore the common ſaying of that good Emperor *Aurelius* was: *Rex vivus Lex*: No Common-wealth can be happy or continue long, but where the Prince is as well ſubject to the law as the People; his example will move them to obedience; *Nec ſic inſtituere ſenſus humanos edicta valent, ac vita regentis*; therefore the counſel of *Pittacus* was good, Let not them break the law who make the Law; *jurato legi quiſquis legem ſanxerit.*

Cap. 29. He is angry with thoſe who ſay, [*That every private man hath a property in his goods.*] Among the Turks indeed no private man hath any property at all; under Chriſtian Princes private men live more happily, who enjoy a property, yet not ſimply abſolute, if we conſider that the Prince hath a right to our goods in caſes of neceſſity, as in his own, and Countries defence, and ſuch like caſes, in this regard no man is born for himſelf, nor hath any man an abſolute property in his own life, which he ought when occaſion urgeth, lay down for his Country: *Dulce & decorum pro patria mori*; therefore *Plato* ſaith well, That our Country requires a ſhare in our birth; the property then of the ſubject excludeth not the Princes right in caſes of neceſſity, but onely his arbitrary power. Hence are theſe

sayings, *Omnia rex imperio possidet, singuli dominio*; Again, *Ad reges potestas omnium pertinet ad singulos proprietas*. The power here spoke of is meant of his just & lawful, not of his arbitrary & tyrannical power.

Cap. 31. In his thirty one chapter he makes a needless distinction between the objects of love, hope, and fear, shewing, [*That love hath reference to goodness; hope and fear to power; the subject of praise is goodness, the subject of magnifying and blessing is power.*] *David* knoweth no such distinction, who in the 18. *Psalm* he loves God for his strength or power, and in another Psalm, he fears him for his mercy, or goodness, *There is* (saith he) *mercy with thee, therefore shalt thou be feared*: So he makes Gods goodness, and not his power the object of his hope or belief; *Psal.* 27. *I hoped to see the goodness of God in the land of the living*; so likewise he praiseth God for his strength or power, as well as for his goodness: *Praise him*, saith he, *for his mighty acts, praise him for his excellent greatness*, *Psal.* 150. and in divers Psalms he magnifyeth God for his salvation, as well as for his power. Now when he saith, that this name (*God*) [*is his own name of relation to us*,] he is deceived; for this is no name of relation at all; his names of relation to us, are, Creator, Redeemer, Father, Lord, King, Master, *&c.*

Part 3. cap. 32. In his third Part and Chap. 1. He saith, [*That our natural reason is the undoubted word of God.*] But I doubt *Leviathan* himself for all his great strength and power, cannot make this good; for Gods word is infallible, so is not our natural reason, which faileth in many things. Gods word saith, That a Virgin did conceive and bear a Son; That God became man; That our bodies shall rise again out of the dust; but our natural reason saith, this is impossible: therefore

when

when St. *Paul* preached the reſurrection to the *Athenians*, who wanted not natural reaſon enough, they thought he had been mad. How comes it that the Apoſtle ſaith; *The natural man underſtandeth not the things of Gods ſpirit*; And Chriſt tells *Peter*, That fleſh and blood, (that is) natural reaſon had not revealed the myſtery of his Divinity to him, but his Father in Heaven; and St. *Paul* ſaith, That he received not the Goſpel of man, nor was he taught it but by the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, *Gal.* 1. 12. And that he was not taught by mans wiſdom, but by the Holy Ghoſt, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13. How comes it I ſay, that the Scripture ſpeaks thus in villifying natural reaſon, if it be the infallible word of God; yea, what need was there of any written word at all if our natural reaſon be that infallible word: doubtleſs *Adam* by his fall loſt much of his knowledge and natural reaſon; *Peter* made uſe of his natural reaſon, when he undertook to diſſwade Chriſt from going up to *Jeruſalem*, and there to ſuffer and die; but Chriſt tells him that he ſavoured the things that be of men, but not of God, *Mat.* 16. 23. Our natural reaſon, ſaith he, *cap.* 32. [*Is a talent not to be folded up in the napkin of an implicit faith:*] This I grant; but I hope he will permit, that our natural reaſon be ſubject to an explicit faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God; and not onely muſt our reaſon be ſubdued to faith, but every imagination in us muſt be caſt down, and every high thing that exalteth it ſelf againſt the knowledge of God, and every thought muſt be brought into captivity, to the obedience of Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 10. 5. And whereas he ſaith, *cap.* 32. [*That our reaſon muſt be imployed in the purchaſe of juſtice, peace, and true religion.*] If reaſon could procure or purchaſe theſe bleſſings, the Gentiles of old, the Jews and Mahumetans of latter years might have had

them as well as we; for in natural reason they are not inferior to us; every one of these following the dictates of reason, think they have the true Religion; as for justice and peace they can never be purchased by reason, but by faith; therefore saith the Apostle: being justified by faith, we have peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord, but his reason by which he would prove, that our natural reason is the undoubted word of God, is very feeble; for saith he, [*There is nothing contrary to it in Gods word.*] By the same means he may prove that *Aristotle*'s Logick, or *Hippocrate*'s Aphorisms are the undoubted word of God; for in them is nothing contrary to it. But was not *Peter*'s reason contrary to Gods word, when he would have dissuaded Christ from suffering; whereas all the prophets had spoken, that Christ ought to have suffered those things, and to enter into his glory; *Luke* 24. 26.

And no less weak is his argument (*cap.* 32.) by which he will prove, that divine dreams [*are not of force to win belief from any man, that knows dreams are for the most part natural, and may proceed from former thoughts*, &c.] He may as well infer, that the pen-men of the Holy Scriptures are not of force to win belief from us, seeing the propher saith, All men are lyers: what if it had said, that men for the most part are lyers; there had been less reason to have inferred that the pen-men of Scriptures were such, and yet Mr. *Hobbs* will infer, that because dreams are for the most part natural; therefore divine dreams are of no credit, that such dreams are of force sufficient to win belief, is plain by the dreams of *Joseph*, *Jacob*'s son, and *Joseph* the husband of *Mary*: with divers others in Scripture. (*cap.* 33.) He is troubled that *Moses* before his death should write

that

that he died, & that his Sepulcher was not known to this day, but in this he troubles himself needlessly; for he writes of his death and sepulcher by anticipation, which is an usual way of writing, amongst some, besides the Jewish tradition is, that *Josua* wrote that last chapter of *Deuteronomy*, long after the death of *Moses*. (*Cap.* 33.) So he is troubled about the words of *Moses*, *Gen.* 12. 6. which are, *And the Canaanite was then in the land*; Hence he infers, that *Moses* wrot not that book, but one who wrot when the Canaanite was not in the land, for *Moses* dyed before he came to it: but I say, that if the Canaanite was not in the land, when he wrot these words, *The Canaanite was then in the land*; he wrot a lye; but indeed *Moses* wrot the History, and writes no vaies absurdly, in showing that the Canaanite was then in the land, but purposely to let us see the condition of Gods children in this life, who though they have right to all they enjoy, yet the wicked keep them under, and they live in fear still of their enemies, as *Abraham* did of the Canaanites, who dominered in that land which *Abraham* received from God, and at the same time he receiv'd it: such like exceptions he makes against some other writers of the old Testament, but they are of no moment or validity, therefore I will spend no paper nor time in their refutation.

In his thirty fourth chapter he tells us, [*Thus there is not one part of the universe, which is not also a body, and that bodies are called substances, because subject to many accidents, and that any incorporeal substance, is as if a man should say, an incorporeal body.*] If there were no real parts of the universe but bodies, then the universe were not universe, but an imperfect system, and deficient in the most noble of all created entities;

to

to wit, incorporeal substances; but God made the world perfect, consisting both of material and immaterial substances; such are Angels and Mens souls, which are neither corporeal in their beeing, nor operation; for if they were corporeal, they must be morral and corruptible, and compounded at least of matter and form, they must be also quantitative, local by circumscription, and movable by physical motion; all which are absurd: and if a substance be the same that a body is, then he must make God corporeal, for he is a substance: now to say that a thing is called substance, because subject to changes, is vain; for substances are so called, because they subsist by themselves, and not in another entity, as accidents do: besides, accidents may be called subjects, because one accident may be the subject of another, as the superficies of a wall is the subject of colours; but accidents can never be called substances, for they cannot subsist of themselve

By the spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters, *Gen.* 1.2. [*He will have to be meant a winde, because if God himself were understood, then motion must be attributed to him and place.*] I know in this he follows *Tertullian*'s opinion; but the Church hath constantly held that there is meant, not a winde, but the spirit of God; by which place they both prove the mystery of the Trinity; the first person being expressed by the word *Elohim*, the second by the word *Berisheth*, or *Beginning*, and the third by the word *Ruah*, or *Spirit*; they also by the same place prove the dignity and power of baptism, in the waters of which Sacrament the Spirit moveth as in the beginning; and indeed it is childish to think that a winde should be there meant, for what use could there be of a winde

winde then, before the creatures were produced. And wheras he is afraid to aſcribe motion and place to God, it ſeems he hath not well obſerved the Scripture phraſe, which ordinarily ſpeaketh of God, *Anthropopathos*, as if he were a man; therefore he is ſaid ſometimes to ſpeak, to ſee, to hear, to diſcend, to laugh, to be angry, to greet, to rejoyce; and in this Hiſtory of the Creation, he is ſaid, to ſpeak, to bleſs, to walk in the Garden, to examine *Adam*, to condemn the Serpent, *&c.* Now whereas Mr. *Hobbs* ſaith, that the ſpirit here mentioned, is the ſame that is ſpoken of, *Gen.* 8. 1. *I will bring my Spirit upon the Earth*: He is miſtaken, and miſalledgeth the words; for thus it is written, *And God made a winde to paſs over the Earth*; for winde in Scripture is never called the Spirit of God. The ſpirit then that dried up the waters of the flood, was the ſame that afterwards divided the red Sea for *Moſes* and the Iſraelites to paſs through; to wit, a drying winde which God had raiſed. He ſaith, [*The word Ghoſt ſignifieth nothing but the imaginary inhabitants of the brain.*] But there he is alſo miſtaken, for it ſignifieth a real immaterial ſubſtance, which we call from the Latin word, *Spirit*; and ſo it was alwaies uſed by the Saxons, and at this day, *Gheeſt* and *Gheiſt* in low and high Dutch do ſignifie the ſame thing or ſpirit.

Cap. 34. When Chriſt walked on the waters, the Diſciples thought they had ſeen a ſpirit or fantaſm, which Mr. *Hobbs* will have [*to be an aerial body.*] But I wonder who ever ſaw an aerial body; the two groſſer Elements are viſible to us, but not the two ſuperior, by reaſon of their ſubtilty and purity. And he is deceived alſo in ſaying, [*The deluſions of the brain are not common to many ages.*] For I have obſerved that divers men to-

ther have seen imaginary castles, temples, armed men, and such like apparitions in the clouds. Now Spirits or Angels have been seen not in their own substances, which are invisible, but in the bodies of men which they assumed; and to say, as he doth, that because spirits are in no place circumscriptively, therefore they are no where, is inconsequent; for though they have no dementions answering to the dementions of place, yet they have their *ubi*, to which they are confined.

Cap. 34. He saith, [*That concerning the creation of Angels, nothing is delivered in the Scriptures.*] What then means the Apostle in his Epistle to the Colossians by things invisible, thrones, dominations, and powers, which he saith, were created? Were not those Angels? But I wonder not that he denies the creation of Angels, for he doeth plainly deny their existence, saying (*cap.* 34.) they are [*but visions, apparitions, images in the fancy, accidents of the brain.*] But when the Holy Scripture calleth Angels Messengers, watchmen, ministring spirits, the hoast of heaven, &c. Doeth it mean onely our fancies and dreams? Are those celestial servants of God, the comforters and protecters of good men, the gatherers together of the elect in the last day, but imaginations? Was that a fancy or an Angel who comforted *Hagar* in the desert? Was the Angel *Gabriel* that appeared to *Mary* but an accident of her brain? Were not the Israelites well guarded from their enemies, when they had no Angels, but fancies to guard them? It seems that *Abraham* and *Lot* entertained not Angels, but dreams and fancies in their houses; and *Abraham* washed the feet of fancies, and for them killed his fat calf and *Jacob* wrestled all night with a fancy; as *Turnus* did,

did, in the Poet, with the shaddow of *Æneas*. Were those fancies of real substances, that St. *Jude* speaks of, who kept not their first estate, but left their habitation, and are now reserved in chains under darkness for the judgement of the great day? and when Christ saith wee shall be like the Angels, doeth he mean that in heaven we shall be like fancies and dreams? I doubt me, Mr. *Hobbs* is possessed with too many such Angels. He is extreamly extravagant in his discourse for the Angels, which but now he would have to be dreams, visions, and fancies, he will have to be God himself. (*cap.* 34.) [*Because the same apparition is called, not only an Angel, but God*, Gen. 16.] Here is a goodly argument: Angels are sometimes called God, therefore they are God indeed: by the same reason he may infer, that Judges and earthly Princes, are gods indeed, because they are called so. The idols of the Gentiles are called gods, are they therefore Gods indeed? Angels are sometimes called *Elohim*, or gods; not only for the excellency of their nature, but likewise for their imployment, in representing the person and authority of God in their embassies: that Angel, who *Gen.* 31. 13. calls himself *the God of Bethel* is thought to be our blessed Saviour, who appeared sometimes to the Patriarchs and other holy men, before his incarnation: and it was this Angel that spake with *Moses* in the bush, and in the cloud; and not the cloud it self, as Mr. *Hobbs* thinks, for he is deceived in thinking that the cloudy pillar spoke with *Moses*. He says, [*It is not the shape, but the use that makes them Angels.*] indeed the shape of men was most useful and most useful in the Angels, for contracting familiarity with men; for which cause the Angel of the Covenant in the fulness of time became man: for

what

what can be so kindly to man, as to be instructed, directed, and defended by man, or by Angels in mans shape: He saith, [*That the Dove and fiery tongues, in being signes of Gods special presence may be called Angels.*] But I say no; for it is not the signification of Gods presence, but the delivering by speech Gods will or message, that makes an Angel or Messenger; for when were dumb Ambassadors ever imployed? If every sign of Gods presence were an Angel, we should have as many Angels, as there be Ceremonies and Sacraments in the Church: yea, every creature were an Angel, for each creature testifieth and representeth to us a Diety, and so every Star, yea, every Fly, and every Herb should be an Angel, *præsentemque docet quæ libet herba Deum*: if he can tell us that the fiery tongues, or Dove, did ever deliver any message in Scripture, (which the Poets fable of *Dodonas* Doves) then I will call them Angels. He saith again, [*That God needeth not to distinguish his celestial servants by names.*] Will he hence infer that therefore they have no names; he may as well say, that God needeth not to distinguish men by names, or to call the stars by their names, *Psal.* 147. Angels are distinguished by names, not for him, but for our weak memories: God needs no such distinctions, but we who are of weak apprehensions.

Cap. 34. He saith, [*That fire is no punishment to impatible creatures, such as are all things incorporeal.*] That the Devil shall be punished with eternal fire and his Angels, is plain by our Saviours words, *Mat.* 25. It follows therefore they are patible creatures, though immaterial; that there is a patability in immaterial substances, is manifest by our own souls, which are affected with the passions of joy and grief, as the body is in a joyful or

in a painful condition; there are alſo ſome paſſions which are called immanent, and immaterial, ſuch is the paſſion of underſtanding; for the ſoul ſuffereth when it underſtandeth. Now how the evil ſpirits in hell ſuffer by fire is not known unto us, but to God; neither is their ſuffering natural, but altogether ſupernatural, and by the power of God, who can as eaſily make fire work on ſpirits, as on the buſh which burned, but conſumed not: as St. *Auſtin* ſheweth, *de civit dei, lib.* 21. *cap.* 10. When Chriſt ſaith, that in the reſurrection we ſhal be like the Angels of God which are in heaven. Mr. *Hobbs* inferreth, (*cap.* 34.) [*That becauſe men then ſhall be corporeal, therefore the Angels are ſuch.*] This is not to ſhew that we ſhall be like the Angels, as Chriſt ſaith, but that the Angels ſhall be like us: neither is it Chriſts ſcope to ſhew there, *Mat.* 22. 30. that we ſhall be like the Angels in every thing; but onely in this, that we ſhall be like them in chaſtity; for there ſhall be no marrying, becauſe no need of poſterity, man being then immortal. He confeſſeth at laſt, (*cap.* 34.) [*That though in the Old Teſtament Angels were but fancies; yet ſome places of the New Teſtament have extorted from his feeble reaſon; a belief that Angels are ſubſtantial and permanent.*] That faith which is extorted from a feeble reaſon muſt needs be very feeble; but indeed true faith is ſtrongeſt, where reaſon is feebleſt, *per didiſti rationem tene fidem*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, He that will lay hold on faith muſt abandon reaſon, which is the ſon of the bond woman, born after the fleſh, but faith is the child of promiſe, and true heir of the Kingdom.

In his thirty eighth chapter he ſaith, [*That if* Adam *had not ſinned, he had had an eternal life on earth.*] And hence he infers, [*That life eternal which*

which Christ hath obtained for his Saints shall be on earth: because the Apostle saith, as in Adam all dye, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, for else the comparison were not proper.] The comparison is not between the two places of heaven and earth, but between the two persons of *Adam* and Christ, and between the two lives, the one earthly which *Adam* lost by introducing mortality, and the other heavenly which Christ hath purchased by overcoming mortality: and as this place fails him, so doth that other, *Psal.* 133. 3. Upon Sion God commanded the blessing, even life for evermore. And *Rev.* 21. 2. *I John saw the holy City, New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven.* And *Acts* 1. 11. *This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as you have seen him go up into heaven.* And *Mat.* 22. In the resurrection they are as the Angels of God in heaven, for they neither marry, nor are given in marriage. What sober minded man will conclude from these places, that our eternal happiness shall be on earth, and not in heaven? For when *David* speaks of life for evermore in *Sion*, he means a lasting happiness which accompanies concord among brethren: for the Hebrew word *Olam* in Scripture, signifieth a continuance for some time, but not eternity: In *Exod.* 21. 6. The servant whose ear was bored, is said to serve his master for ever, that is, so long as he liveth, and not everlastingly. *Samuel* is said to appear before the Lord, and there to abide for ever, 1 *Sam.* 1. 22. Will any infer hence that *Samuel* was to continue in his office for all eternity: The Perpetuus Dictator at *Rome* continued not for ever, though he is called perpetual: So then life for evermore in *Sion* is a long continuing happiness; and yet *Sion* in Scripture is divers times taken for heaven, where is

onely

onely true and eternal life. As impertinent is that place which he alledgeth, *Rev.* 2. 7. *To him that overcometh I will give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.* This saith he, [*was the tree of Adams eternal life, but this life was to have been on earth.*] But he is quite out of the way; for the Paradise mentioned here, is that which Christ speaks of to the good thief, *Thou shalt be this day with me in Paradise*, that is in heaven: for earthly Paradise was destroyed by the flood, and so was the tree of life, which might for some time have prolonged *Adams* age, by supplying the decay of the radical moysture, but could not have continued it for ever: only our blessed Saviour the true tree of life here mention'd can protract our life into eternity: now that Paradise was destroyed by the flood is plain by *Moses*, *Gen.* 6. saying, that the flood rose higher fifteen cubits, then the highest mountains. Besides, if Paradise had been to continue where need was there to build an Ark for *Noah* and his family, seeing they could have been saved in Paradise, and so the other creatures likewise: And whereas he saith, [*That the New Jerusalem when Christ comes again, shall come down to Gods people from heaven, and not they goup to it from earth.*] Is ridiculous; for *Rev.* 21. 2. by the New *Jerusalem* coming down from God, is meant the Church of Christ, whose original calling, protection, and happiness is from God, so that this is not a proper, but a tropical descent. The Church is called *Jerusalem* there, and elsewhere, because she is, or ought to be the City of Peace, and as *Jerusalem* of old was the place of Gods worship, and of his peculiar presence, so is the Church now; which is called new, as having cast off the old man, and old ceremonies, is renewed in the spirit of her minde,

minde; and is regenerate by water and the ſpirit So he ſheweth his vanity, when he proves out of *Acts* 1. 11. [*That Chriſt ſhall come down to govern his people eternally here, and not take them up to govern them in heaven.*] For in that place there is no mention of his government here on earth, nor of the eternity thereof; but onely that he ſhall return after the ſame manner that he went up, that is to ſay, glorioufly, riding on the clouds, and attended by Angels: Now if any man would know the reaſon or end of Chriſts ſecond coming, he ſhall finde in *Daniel* 2. *Mat.* 25. and other places of Scripture; that it is not to erect an earthly Kingdom, which ſhall continue for ever, but as the Apoſtle ſaith, to render vengeance to the wicked, and to us that are afflicted, peace. Or as it is in our Creed, to judge the quick and the dead; ſo then he ſhall not return as an earthly Prince, to ſet up his throne here on earth, which is his foot-ſtool, but as a Judge in his circuit, who having condemned ſome, and abſolved others, returns again to the place of his reſidence.

But he ſays, (*cap.*38.) [*That there is neither Scripture nor Reaſon to prove that after the reſurrection, men are to live eternally in heaven.*] What then will he ſay to theſe paſſages, *Mat.* 5. *Great is your reward in heaven*; Chriſt would have ſaid, great is your reward on earth, if he had purpoſed to erect an earthly kingdom. So *Mat.*6. we are adviſed to lay up our treaſures, not on earth, but in heaven: this were to no purpoſe, if we were to live eternally on earth, not in heaven. So *Joh.*14. *I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there you may be.* I pray was it not to heaven that Chriſt went to prepare that place: is not heaven his Fathers houſe, where there are many mantions?

ons? Earth is never called his houſe, nor are the Saints ſaid here to have an houſe or habitation, but to ſojourn as in Tents: Heaven is the houſe where we muſt dwell, if we will beleeve St. *Paul* who was caught up into this houſe, who ſpeaks not by hearſay, but by knowledge: [for we know, ſaith he, that if our earthly houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a building of God, an houſe not made with hands eternal in the heavens, 2 *Cor.* 5, 1.] Why did St. *Paul* deſire to be diſſolved and be with Chriſt, *Phil.* 1. if he was to enjoy Chriſt upon earth onely: he ſhould rather have deſired to be diſſolved, that Chriſt might be with him on earth, then he to be with Chriſt in heaven: *Enoch* was tranſlated, and *Elijah* was caught up into heaven, to aſſure us of our right and habitation there, for this cauſe our Savicur opened heaven at his Baptiſm, and after his Reſurrection aſcended thither, to take poſſeſſion thereof for us; and it is fit, that where the Head is, there the body ſhould be; where the King keeps his reſidence, thither his ſervants ſhould repair. Where ſhould the children dwell, but in their Fathers houſe: now that is heaven; therefore we are taught to lift up our eyes thither, and to pray, *Our Father which art in Heaven.* Here then Mr *Hobbs* hath both authority and reaſon againſt his earthly happineſs, which ſavours too much of *Mahumets* earthly Paradiſe.

It is childiſh what he ſaith, (*cap.* 38.) That the earthly kingdom of the Saints [*ſhall be called a new kingdom of heaven, becauſe our King ſhall then be God, whoſe Throne is in heaven.*] I would know of Mr. *Hobbs*; Whether our King, Chriſt Jeſus be not God now, as well as after the reſurrection, and whether his Throne be not now in heaven,

as

as well as it shall be then. If so, why may not each earthly kingdom now be called the Kingdom of heaven, seeing our King is God, and his Throne is in heaven: perhaps he will tell us that Christ is God, but not King as yet; but I say, in that he is God, he is also King of all the earth, as *David* witnesseth, *Psal.* 47.7. And we find in the *Apocalyps*, that there is written upon his garment King of Kings; and therefore he confesseth before his earthly Judge that he was born to be a King. And when he was hanging on the Crosse he was King of the Jews. To no purpose also doth he alledge that of St. *John*, *cap.* 3. *v.* 13. [*No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man that is in heaven.*] To prove that man shall ascend to his happiness no higher then Gods foot-stool, the earth: because no man hath ascended into the highest heaven before Christ, will it therefore follow, that no man shall ascend after him; or because no man hath ascended by his own power, but Christ onely: therefore no man shall ascend by the power of Christ thither: he were as good infer, that no man before Christ overcame death by his own power, therefore no man after him shall overcom death by Christs power; and consequently there shal be no resurrection. But if we ascend not higher then the earth, the Apostle hath deluded us, in saying, That we shall be caught up together in the cloudes, to meet the Lord in the air, and so we shall be ever with the Lord: he should have said rather, that the Lord shall be ever with us. What good will our πολίτευμα Burgilhip, or deviation do us in heaven, if we shall never go thither, what comfort can we take in the society and company of Angels, or they of ours, if we shall never cohabit together in heaven.

He

He will not have (44,38.) the reſurrection of the body to be proved out of Chriſts words to the Sadducees: *I am the God of Abraham, &c. for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for they all live to him, Luke* 20.37,38. His reaſon is, becauſe the words are to be underſtood onely of the immortality of the ſoul: But I ſay theſe words prove both the ſouls immortality and the bodies reſurrection; for if *Abraham*'s ſoul had been dead, how could God have been his God: that is, his Protector, Comforter, Saviour? Here is the ſouls immortality. And if *Abraham*'s body had been eternally dead, how could God have been the God of *Abraham*; for *Abraham*'s ſoul is not *Abraham*, but a part; now God is not the God of a part, but of the whole man: therefore St. *Luke* ſaith, *They all live to God*; the departed Saints then are no more dead to God, then our children when they are aſleep, are dead to us: Therefore Chriſt ſaith of *Lazarus*, being four daies dead, that he was aſleep; ſo our departed friends are dead to us, but aſleep to God: and indeed the ſouls immortality, and bodies reſurrection are ſo linked together, that who denieth or affirmeth the one, denyeth or affirmeth the other; neither had Chriſt's anſwer ſatisfied the Sadducees, had it not proved as well the reſurrection of the body, as the immortality of the ſoul; for they denied both.

[*It is not* (ſaith he) *apparent in Scripture, that mans ſoul is in his own nature eternal.*] That the ſoul is immortal, is apparent by theſe Scriptures, *Eccleſ.* 12.7. *The ſpirit ſhall return to God that gave it.* If it dyeth, how can it return to God? It returns rather to nothing. So *Matth.* 10.28. *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the ſoul.* If the ſoul cannot be killed when the body

is

is destroyed, how comes it to dye? So *Matth.*22. 32. *God is the God of Abraham*, &c. *not of the dead but of the living.* So *Phil.*1.23. *Paul* desireth to be dissolved, and to be with Christ. When he is dissolved, his body could not be with Christ; it is his soul then; which to be with Christ, is to live with Christ. So 1 *Pet.* 3.19. Christ went and preached to the spirits in prison. What did he preach to dead spirits? So *Revel.* 6.9. The souls cry under the Altar, and 7.9. They are clothed in white, with palms in their hands; those phrases do not speak of dead souls. But he would fain prove out of *Job* 14.7. That life immortal beginneth not in man, till the resurrection. But this place will advantage him nothing: for we say the same with *Job*, That a tree being cast down will bud again, and that man riseth not till the heavens be no more; that is, till the resurrection, when the heavens shall be dissolved with fire, as St. *Peter* saith; so that life immortal beginneth not in man till then; if by man he means the whole man. But hence is no argument that can be drawn against the immortality of the soul: for though man dye and consume, yet the soul dieth not; no more then the soul eateth, drinketh sleepeth, walketh, *&c.* for these are the actions of the man, not of the soul.

Because Mr. *Hobbs* (*cap.*38.) thinks [*this doctrine will appear to most men a novelty, he will maintain nothing in it, but attend the end of that dispute of the sword, by which all sorts of doctrine are to be approved or rejected.*] He need not trouble himself about the novelty of this doctrine; for it is not new, but as old as *Cerinthus* the heretick, who lived about ninety years after Christ; he was one of the first that maintained the conceit of Christs earthly kingdom; who notwithstanding told

Pilate,

Pilate, that his kingdom was not of this world. About one hundred forty five years after Christ, the *Papuzean* hereticks, being the spawn of the *Cataphrygians*, whose father was *Montanus*, held the town called *Pepuza* in upper *Phrygia*, to be the new *Jerusalem*, mentioned, *Heb.* 12. and *Rev.* 21. Where Christ was to raign eternally, whereas *Cerinthus* his raign was to last but a thousand years; whose Sectaries were after-wards called Chiliasts, or Millinaries. As for the other branch of his opinion concerning the souls sleep or death, and its resurrection or vivification in the last day, that is also no novelty; but an old heresie maintained by the Arabian hereticks about two hundred and seventeen yeers after Christ; these were called θνηλοψύχιται, that is, mortall soules: The *Psychopannychits* of this age, come somewhat neer these Arabians; for though they hold not the death or dissolution of the soul; yet they say it sleeps with the body in the grave: this error therefore Mr. *Hobbs* is no novelty, yet we are beholding to you, that you will maintain nothing in it, till the sword establish it, and then you will be content to approve of it; But what if the sword should dethrone Christ and set up *Mahumet*? Must that sword be obeyed?

Concerning the place of hell, and the nature of hell fire, I will not dispute with you, seeing the Scripture doth not punctually set down, and in proper terms either the one or the other; yet we may collect by some passages of holy writ, that hell is in the lower parts of the world; for when it speaks of hell, it still names a discent or going down; *Core* went down to hell; the rich glutton in hell lifted up his eyes towards *Abraham*. The beast is said to rise cap. 38.

the out of bottomless pit, and yet stands with reason, that the place of the damned should be as remote from heaven, as may be, which can be no where, but in the bowels of the earth. The names of ἅδης in Greek, and *infernus* in Latine intimate so much; the exactest description we have of hell, is in *Isa.* 30. 33. *Tophet is ordained of old, &c. he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire, and much wood, the breath of the Lord like a stream of Brimston doth kindle it.* The Angels are said to be cast down to hell, 2 *Pet.* 2. 4. And Christ descended into hell; all which shew that it is beneath us; and this visible world.

Because the Prophets in the old Testament by allegorical terms describe the happiness of Christs Church under the Gospel; therefore Mr. *Hobbs* will needs (*cap.* 38.) have these phrases to be understood of an earthly kingdom after the resurrection; but the Prophets speak of pleasant rivers and fields, of woods and groves, of horses and charriots, of eating and drinking, and all kinde of earthly delights; which if Mr. *Hobbs* understand literally, I shall think his opinion relisheth too much of the *Alcoran*; and that he reviveth again the heresie of *Cerinthus*, which the Fathers of the Church hath long since exploded; as being too gross and carnal, and such as none will beleeve but carnal men: *Nulla modo ista possunt, nisi a carnalibus credi*, as St. *Austin* saith, *l.* 20. *de civit. c.* 7. The kingdom of God consisteth not in meat and drink, saith the Apostle; the words that they speak are spirit and truth; and are spiritually to be understood: if we shall be like the Angels after the resurrection, as our Saviour assures us, what other delights can we have then, but such as they enjoy now; why should not

heaven

heaven be the place of our abode as well as theirs; they need not the earth to reside in now, neither shall we then. But he saith, [*That the subjects of God should have any place higher then his foot-stool, seemeth not sutable to the dignity of a King.*] It may be so Mr. *Hobbs*, if you speak of earthly Kings, who pride themselves in their supposed greatness, and stand upon punctilios: but it is not so with the King of heaven, who made no scruple to wash his servants feet; and to tell them, that they should sit with him upon twelve thrones, to jude the twelve tribes of *Israel*. And assures us, that he will grant to him who overcometh, to sit down with him in his throne; even, as I (saith he) also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne, *Rev.* 1. 21. And St. *John* tells us, that Christ hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, *Rev.* 1. 6. It will not then be unsutable to his dignity, if we ascend higher then his footstool.

In his forty one chapter he tells us, [*That the Kingdom of Christ is not to begin till the general resurrection.*] What hath Christ been all this while a King without a Kingdom; or hath his Church been all this time a people without a King; sheep without a Shepherd, a body without a head? Are Christians in a worse condition then other people? And is not Christ highly wronged, who having conquered a kingdom with his blood, and having got the victory over all his enemies; is notwithstanding now 1652. years without his kingdom; and must be without it till the general resurrection. How can this stand, that he should so many yeers since by his Apostles and their successors subdue so many nations to his obedience, by that sharpe two edged sword of his mouth; and yet all this while cap. 41

have no kingdom; could *Alexander* in three yeers ſpace ſubdue ſo many kindoms: and Chriſt after ſo many hundred years be without his kingdom; what is become of his rod of Iron, by which he was to rule the ſtubborn Gentiles? How can this ſtand, that he aſcended up on high, led captivity captive, and gave liberal gifts to men; yea, likewiſe hath preſcribed divers laws ordinances, hath diſtributed divers rewards, and inflicted divers puniſhments, and yet is no King? he confeſſeth to *Pilate*, that he was even at that time a King, when he ſtood before him, ready to ſuffer death for his ſubjects: but withal acknowledgeth, that his kingdom was not of this world, and therefore refuſeth to be an earthly king. When Satan profferred him all the kingdoms of the world, *Matth.* 4. And when the Jews ſought to make him King, he abſented himſelf: If he was a King in his humiliation, ſhall he now be no King in his glory and exaltation? Now Mr. *Hobbs* gives us a reaſon (*cap.* 41.) why Chriſts Kingdom begins not till the reſurrection, [*Becauſe then he ſhall reward every man according to his work and this is to excute the office of a King.*] This is a feeble reaſon, for a King may be a King, though he differ the rewards or puniſhments which his ſubjects have deſerved. Shall we ſay, that *David* was not king, becauſe he did not reward *Joab*, *Shimei*, and the ſons of *Barzillai* according to their works, but left that to his ſon *Solomon*, both to reward *Barzillai*'s ſons for their good ſervice to *David* in his affliction, and to puniſh *Job* with death, for the murthering of *Abner* and *Amaſa*; and likewiſe *Shimei*, for his railling againſt the king. There is a time for all things; even for puniſhments and rewards; and if the differing of theſe do argue no king, he may then as well ſay, that God himſelf

ſelf is no King, who differred the drowning of the world one thouſand ſix hundred years. And the puniſhing of the *Amorites* four hundred years. And ſo doth put off the rewarding of men till the world to come. But he tells us, [*That Chriſt aſcribed kingly power to the Scribes and Phariſees, becauſe they ſit in Moſes chair.*] But then Chriſt ſhould have wronged the Roman Governors, in whom he acknowledged kingly power, by paying tribute, and by ſubmitting himſelf to be judged by them. Their ſitting then in *Moſes* chair doeth not imply kingly power; but their power in expounding the law of *Moſes*. And it is as weak an inference to ſay, that Chriſt is not King of his Church, [*Becauſe he would not divide the inheritance, between the two brethren, or becauſe he came to ſave the world, not to judge it*;] For dividing of inheritances belonging not to Chriſts ſpiritual kingdom; neither was it the end of Chriſts comming to judge, that is to condemn the world, for the Greek word ſignifieth both, but to ſave it; for his name was Jeſus a Saviour, becauſe he came to ſave his people from their ſins. And no leſs weak is this reaſon: [*The time of Chriſts preaching is called regeneration, therefore it is no kingdom.*] Regeneration is not the time, but the fruit and effect of Chriſts preaching: and ſo far is regeneration from being inconſiſtent with Chriſts Kingdom; that our Saviour tells us in plain tearms; except we be regenerate we cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, *John* 3.

In his two and fortty chapter he broacheth a ſtrange wheemſie concerning the bleſſed Trinity, in ſaying, [*That God who hath been repreſented (that is perſonated) thrice, to wit, by Moſes, by Chriſt, and by the Apoſtles, may properly enough be ſaid to be three Perſons, as repreſented by* cap. 42.

the Apostles, the holy Spirit by which they spake is God, as represented by Christ, the Son is that God, as represented by Moses and the high Priests, the Father is that God. Hence the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the signification of the Godhead, are never used in the old Testament; for they are Persons, that is, they have their names from representing, which could not be, till divers men had represented Gods Person, &c.] Here is strange stuffe: For first, The word Person in the Trinity, was never taken by Divines for a Visard, a personating, or representation, but for a peculiar way of subsisting; therefore by the Greek Church the word ὑποστασις was used, till wanton and idle wits began to raise differences about that word; and then πρόσωπον was used answering to the Latine word, *Persona*, and is defined thus, ὁ ἄναρχος τρόπος τῆς ἀιδίου ὑπάρξεως by *Justin Martyr* and *Damascen*; an eternal or unbeginning manner of an eternal existing; so that in the same essence there is a threefold way of subsisting: The Fathers existence is from himself, the Sons from the Father, the Spirits from both: so in man, there is the soul, the intellect and will; these three are but one essence, yet differently subsisting; the soul of it self, the intellect from the soul, and the will from both. Secondly, if personating, or representing makes the persons in the Trinity, it will follow, that there have been and are more then three Persons; nay, I may truly say innumerable, for God hath been represented, not onely by *Moses*, but by *Josuah* also and his successors; by *Aaron* the high Priest, and all his successors; by all Judges also and Kings, who are therefore called gods: there must be then as many persons, as there have been personatings or representations; and in this respect the Trinity may be called a Legion, or rather

ther innumerable persons. Thirdly, Why should God be called the Holy Spirit, as he was represented by the Apostles, rather then by being personated by *Moses*, or by Christ; his reason is, because the Apostles spoke by the Spirit: I pray, did not *Moses* and Christ speak by the same Spirit. St. Peter saith, that the holy men of old spake as the Spirit moved them. Or why is God by him called Father, as he was represented by *Moses*, rather then as he was represented by Christ? Was there more Paternity in *Moses*, then in any other man, or in Christ, who by *Isaiah* is called the everlasting Father? Or why is he called Father, as personated by the high Priests. Fourthly, It is untrue what he saith, that the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are never used in the old Testament. For *Psal.* 89. which contains not only a propheſie of *Solomon*, but also of Christ, it is thus written: *He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father*, *Psal.* 89. 26. and *Isa.* 9. he is called the everlasting Father. So *Psal.* 2. Christ is called Son, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*: And *Isa.* 9. *For unto us a Son is given.* So the third Person or Spirit is mentioned; *The Spirit of God moved upon the Waters*, *Gen.* 1. Now that this was no winde, as some have thought, is plain; because air was created afterwards, and this Spirit is said to move, or by moving to cherish the waters: but the winde is an enemy to the waters; both in regard of its siccity, and impetuosity; neither is the winde ever called the Spirit of God, as we have shewed already. So *Joel* 2. *I will pour my Spirit upon all flesh*: And *Zach.* 12. *I will pour upon the house of* David *and the Inhabitants of* Jerusalem *the Spirit of grace and supplication.* But he saith, that these names are not used in the signification of the God-head, but he is deceived;

for when the child Christ is called the everlasting Father by *Isaiah*, this cannot be in signification of his humanity; for how can a little child be an everlasting Father, but in respect of his Godhead.

He saith, (*Cap.* 42.) [*If the Supreme King have not his regal power in this world, by what authority can obedience be required to his Officers.*] This is not to be doubted, but the Supreme King hath his regal power in this world; for this cause he tells his Apostles after his resurrection, That all power was given to him in heaven and in earth; therefore he sends them abroad into all nations of this world, teaching them to observe all things which he had commanded them, *Matth.* 28. If then he hath regal power in the world, why should not his Officers be obeyed. 'Tis true, Christs Kingdom is not of this world; will it therefore follow, that it is not in this world? For if in this world he subdueth the nations to his Scepter by the sword of his word, if he leads captivity captive, if he giveth gifts unto men, if he prescribe laws, and punisheth the offendors, shall we not say he hath Kingly power in this world: if the Kings and Potentates of the earth, have submitted their scepters to his Heraulds, have received his yoak, and have placed his cross upon their crowns in sign of subjection, is he not their Supreme King, whose dominion here is called the Kingdom of grace: his other Kingdom in the next world, shal be the kingdom of glory, which M. *Hobs* confounds with this of grace: as for the coercive or commanding power of Ministers which he speaks against; I must needs confess, there is not so much, as some could take upon them; yet to deny all coercive power, is to deny the commission which this great King, *Luke* 14. gave to his servants,

vants, that they ſhould compel thoſe in the high-waies to come to his ſupper. And albeit miniſters are called fiſher-men, and not hunters; yet fiſher-men uſe ſome force in drawing their fiſh to the ſhore: and indeed, none can come to me, ſaith Chriſt, except the Father draw him: as for his doctrine of diſſimulation in matters of Religion, both with God and man; I dare not aſſent thereto, for God, who is the God of truth, loveth truth in the inward parts, he that is not with him, is againſt him, who gathereth not with him ſcattereth. Linnin and Woolin in the ſame garment, different ſeeds in the ſame ground, an ox and an aſs at the ſame plough are not pleaſing to him. *Pulcra eſt concordia cordis & oris.* If to think one think and ſpeak another did argue *Catalin* to be an evil man; ſhall it not argue the like in a Chriſtian. *Aliud in lingua promptum, aliud in pectore clauſum habere.*

When he tells us (*cap.* 42.) [*That Chriſts commiſſion to his Diſciples and Apoſtles, was to proclaim his Kingdom, not preſent but to come.*] He is miſtaken; for the Apoſtles commiſſion was to proclaim that the Kingdom of heaven was at hand, ἤγγικε, in the perfect tenſe, ſhews that it was already come, or at hand. *Mat.* 3. and 4. And he ſheweth, *Luke* 17.21. That the Kingdom of God was within them: And *Luke* 11. 20. That the kingdom of God was come upon them: If then this kindom of Chriſt was not to come till after the reſurrection, how could it be ſaid to be then at hand? Whereas already there are 1652 years paſt, beſides, what are to come. When he ſaith, (*cap.* 42.) [*That the Apoſtles had no power to make laws, but to perſwade, that they did counſel and adviſe, but not command; that their precepts were invitations and callings, not commands, that they might be without*

sin disobeyed:] And much more to this purpose, he speaks absurdly; for how can he make precepts to be counsels and not commands. Is not *præcipio* and *mando* all one. Are not the ten Commandments ten precepts? Are they to be called counsels? did not the Apostles make laws, and enjoyn them to be observed, *Acts* 15. St. *Paul* doth not counsel, but command the Thessalonians to work with their own hands, 1 *Thes.* 4. 11. He hopes they will do the things he commands them, 2 *Thes.* 3. 4. *Timothy* is to command as well as to teach, 1 *Tim.* 4. 11. He must command the rich men of this world, 1 *Tim.* 6. 17. The Apostle puts a difference between counsel and command; when he saith, that concerning virgins he had no command; but gives his counsel in that case, 1 *Cor.* 7. 25. Now that Christ and his Apostles may be disobeyed without sin, is a sinful opinion; for Christ tels us, that if he had not come and spoken to the Jews, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloke for their sin, *John* 15. 24. St *John* writes to his brethren, that they might not sin, 1 *John* 2. 1. to wit, if they obey and observe what he writes; otherwise, they must needs sin. Disobedience is not onely a sin, but as *Samuel* saith, it is as hainous as the sin of witchcraft or idolatry.

He makes a needless difference (*cap.* 42.) between a minister and a servant, [*That servants are obliged by their condition to what is commanded them, whereas ministers are obliged onely by their undertaking.*] But indeed these words, servant and minister are promiscuously used; for if servants are obliged by their condition to what is commanded them; then ministers are servants, for this obligation lieth upon them. And if ministers are obliged by their undertaking, then servants are ministers

ministers, for what they undertake they are obliged to perform. Christ, *Mat.* 20. 26, and 27, useth the words διάκονος & δοῦλος for the same thing. And so he is called sometimes δοῦλος, and sometimes διάκονος, and this word *Diaconus* is given sometimes to the meanest servant, sometimes to the Magistrate, as *Rom.* 13. sometimes to Preachers, sometimes to Church-Officers called *Deacons*, Ambassadors are called also by this name; and they are said διακονεῖν to serve or to be Deacons.

He will have (*Chap.* 42.) [*Princes to be called Shepherds or Pastors, because they are to teach the people.*] But indeed they are called Pastors from feeding, not from teaching; neither is it the office of a King to preach or administer the Sacraments: No man taketh upon him (saith the Apostle) this honor, but he that is called of God, as *Aaron* was: he should have said, *As Moses was*, if he had been called to perform the Priests Office: Therefore Christian Soveraigns are not instituted to teach the word of their Baptisme, as he saith; for Baptisme is a Sacrament of our regeneration, and of our admission to be members of Christs body: by it Princes and Subjects are washed from sin, but not instituted to preach; the Emperour hath no more power to perform the Priests office, or to preach by vertue of his Baptisme, than his meanest Subject. And if the Kings Baptisme doth not authorize him to teach at all, much lesse [*to teach what doctrine he will, and to exercise absolute Power over his subjects*] as Mr. *Hobbs* saith. For absolute power is in God onely; they are tyrants, not lawfull Princes, that will claim absolute power over their subjects. And if in Baptisme had invested Princes with power over their subjects, what power hath the Turk, the Persian, the Mogor, the King of China, the great Cham-

Cham over their Subjects, who were never baptized: and to allow Princes power to teach what they will, is to make them absolute lords, not onely over our bodies and goods, but over our souls also, and to enslave our understandings to their wills.

When he saith, (*cap.* 42.) *In that* Urim *and* Thummim *was given to the high Priest, it was given to the civil Soveraign; for such next under God was the high Priest in the Common-wealth of* Israel.] He contradicts himself; for this high Priest to whom *Urim* and *Thummim* was given first, was *Aaron*, whom not long before he subjected to *Moyses*, *cap.* 40. where he saith, [*That not* Aaron, *but* Moyses *alone had next under God the Soveraignity over the Israelites, and that not onely in causes of civil policy, but also of religion.*] Here we see how he makes and unmakes the Soveraignity of Princes; and not onely doeth he make *Moyses* for his time, but also the Scribes and Pharisees who sate in his chair, (that is to say, expounded his law) supreme civil Soveraigns, whereas the legislative power, and civil Soveraignity was in the Romans by right of conquest; which our Saviour did acknowledge by paying tribute, and counselling to give to *Cæsar*, that which were *Cæsars*.

He (*cap.* 42.) [*will not have excommunication to be a punishment, but onely a denouncing of punishment, that Christ shall inflict at the day of Judgement.*] But I say that excommunication is not a bare denouncing, but a real suffering of punishment, and of such a punishment as is most grievous; to wit, a separation from Gods people, and the benefits which they enjoy: for if the *Abstenti* in the Primitive Church, held it a great punishment to be debarred from the Sacrament for a while; how much more grievous is it to be cut off from the mystical

myſtical body of Chriſt, and to be excluded from the Communion of the Saints, and of all the priviledges which they do now, and ſhall hereafter enjoy.

He denieth (*cap.*42.) [*that there is any ſpiritual Common-wealth among men in this world.*] This he grounds upon two reaſons; [*1. becauſe it is the ſame thing with the Kingdom of Chriſt, which is not of this world.* Secondly, *There are no men on earth whoſe bodies are ſpiritual.*] Theſe reaſons are very weak: For firſt, becauſe a ſpiritual Common-wealth and Chriſts Kingdom are the ſame, it will follow, that there is a ſpiritual Common-wealth amongſt men, which is the Kingdom of grace here, where Chriſt raigneth in the hearts of his faithful people; which though it be not of this world, yet it is in this world; as I have ſhewed already: And of this Kingdom our Saviour ſpeaks, when he ſaith, *The Kingdom of God is within you*; *Luke* 17.21. Which conſiſteth in *righteouſneſs, peace, and joy in the holy Ghoſt*, *Rom.*14.17. Secondly, To ſay that Chriſt hath not here a ſpiritual Common-wealth, becauſe mens bodies are not ſpiritual, is ridiculous; for Chriſts ſubjects here are ſpiritual, though their bodies be corporeal, becauſe they are animated, regulated, directed by the ſpirit. *They are regenerated by the ſpirit*, John 3. *They walk not after the fleſh, but after the ſpirit*, Rom.8. *The ſpirit helpeth their infirmities, and teacheth them to pray*, Rom.8. *The holy ſpirit dwelleth in them*, 2 Tim.1.14. *God hath given them of his ſpirit*, 1 John 4.13. *They are ſealed with the ſpirit of promiſe*, Ephes. 1. 13. *They have the fruits of the ſpirit, which are love, joy, peace, long-ſuffering*, &c. Gal. 5. 22. Therefore Chriſts ſubjects, though they are here cloathed with fleſh yet are called ſpiritual: Gal 6. 1. *You which are ſpiritual, reſtore ſuch a one in the ſpirit of meekneſs.*

meekness. These are distinguished from carnal or natural men. 1 Cor 3.1. *I could not speak to you brethren as to spiritual men, but as to carnal.* So 1 Cor. 2. 14,15. *The natural man perceiveth not the things of the spirit of God*; (but he that is spiritual discerneth all things. So their food is spiritual, 1 Cor. 9. 11. Their meat and drink is spiritual, 1 Cor. 10. 3,4. Their songs are spiritual, Eph. 5. 19. Their house is spiritual, 1 Pet. 2. 5. And their sacrifice is spiritual, 1 Pet. 2. 5. Can we say then that Christs Kingdom or Common-wealth, as he calls it, is not spiritual?

He (*cap. 42.*) [*will not have the members of a Common-wealth to depend one of another, but to adhere together. They depend only* (saith he) *on the Soveraign, which is the soul of the Common-wealth.*] But there is a dependence, as well as a coherence in a dead body, there is a coherence of members, but no dependence; but in a living body, there is both: though the body depend on the soul, it will not therefore follow, that the members do not depend one of another; for the hands and feet depend on the stomach, to be fed by it, and it depends on them, to be defended, provided, and carried by them; the like may be said of the other members. So in a Common-wealth, the Soveraign depends on the people for assistance, maintenance, and defence; they depend on him for counsel, government, and peace. The members of the Common-wealth depend on the Clothyer for cloaths, on the Husbandman for food, on the Physition for health, on the Divine for instruction, on the Lawyer for counsel, &c. And these depend on each other.

Heresie (saith he) (*cap. 42.*) [*is nothing else but a private opinion; obstinately maintained, contrary to the opinion which the publick person hath commanded*

to

to be taught. Hence an opinion publickly appointed to be taught, cannot be hereſie, nor the Princes that authoriſe them, hereticks.] It ſeems then by this definition, that *Arianiſm* was onely an hereſie, whilſt it was maintained by *Arius* a private perſon; but when it was authoriſed publickly by the Arian Princes, it was no more an hereſie: and ſo now, not *Arius*, but *Athanaſius* that oppoſed it muſt be called an heretick, by Mr. *Hobbs*, contrary to the judgment of all learned men, and the Church of God hitherto. The great Turk, and the Mahometans, who profeſs at this day the ſame damnable doctrine of *Arius*, are not hereticks, but the Chriſtians within his dominions, who are of another opinion, theſe are your hereticks Mr. *Hobbs*; by this your definition, you may call Chriſt and his Apoſtles hereticks, for they held doctrines contrary to the traditions and opinions of the Scribes and Phariſees, who (as you ſay) ſat in *Moſes* chair. It is not the perſon private or publick that makes an heretick, but it is the doctrine, repugnant to Gods word, and the articles of our faith, maintained obſtinately for ſiniſtrous ends, as lucre, honor, &c. that makes hereſie; a private man may maintain an opinion in Philoſophy contrary to the opinion of the Prince, and yet no heretick in this, becauſe he holds nothing againſt our Chriſtian faith, his opinion may be erroneous but not hereſical.

In his three and forty chapter he tells us, [*That the faith of Chriſtians ever ſince Chriſts time, hath had for foundation, the reputation of Fathers and the authority of Chriſtian Soverains.*] This is to build our faith upon a ſandy foundation, which with every blaſt will be overturned; the authority and reputation of men are but arms of fleſh, and broken reeds to rely upon; theſe may be motives

to

to induceus to give our assent,as the testimony of that woman, *John* 4. induced many of the Samaritans of that City to beleeve on Christ? But the foundation of their faith was Christ himself; who bestowed that gift upon them, as he doeth upon us. And how can mans reputation or authority be the foundation of that which exceeds all humane reason and capacity; but such is faith: Besides, faith it self is the ground of our justification and salvation; for we are both justified and saved by faith; but if man be the ground of our faith, he must also be the ground of our justification and saluation;and soChrist died & rose in vain. But the Apostle sheweth us the true foundation of our faith in these words: *For other foundation can no man lay, then that is laid, which is Jesus Christ*, 1 *Cor.*3.11. Christ therefore as he is revealed to us in his word, is the foundation of our faith: besides, *By faith we are the sons of God*, saith the Apostle,*Gal.*3. But we were in a bad condition if our filiation depended on the authority of Princes,or reputation of Pastors.

In his forty fourth chapter he expounds these words of *Matth.* 9. 34. *Belzebub* the Prince of Devils, that is, [*He hath principality over fantasms that appear in the air.*] So that he makes [*Demons fantasms, or spirits of illusion to signifie allegorically the same thing.*] But I do not read that Devils in Scripture are called fantasms, or fantasms named Devils: when the Disciples, *Mat.* 14. saw Jesus walking on the sea, they thought they had seen a fantasm; did they mean the devil by this word? So when Christ, *Mat.*4. was tempted of the devil,is it meant that he was tempted by a fantasm? Devils are spirits and real substances,and not phantasms or fictions of the brain, as we shewed before of Angels. I deny not but Satan

cap.44.

Satan may represent to the outward sense, as well as to the inward or imagination, divers shapes of things to delude men; which shapes may be called fantasms, as that which *Suidas* calls a diabolical fantasm φαντασμα δαιμονιωδες; which indeed was but a deluding shadow or fantasm, and not the Devil himself; who is an invisible spirit: therefore although there be in the heathen Poets fabulous doctrines concerning Demons, we must not hence infer with Mr. *Hobbs*, [*That Demons are but idols or fantasms of the brain, without any real nature of their own, distinct from human fancy.*] For so he may as wel infer, that God is but a fancy, because the Poets have delivered many fabulous doctrines concerning the gods. He that afflicted *Job*, tempted Christ, buffetted *Paul*, and hath been from the beginning an enemy to the womans seed, is more then a fantasm or idol of the brain.

Cap. 44. After Mr. *Hobbs* hath toyled himself in vain, to prove that Christ hath no kingdom in this world, at last is content to allow Christ the kingdom of grace, which is as much as we desire; for we know that the kingdom of glory is not yet come; Christ then is King of his Church militant here, and raigneth in the hearts of his faithful, and performs all the offices of a King, even in this world, by prescribing laws, by ruling, defending, rewarding, punishing, though not in so ample a maner, as hereafter; he also conquereth and subdueth the enemies of his Church, though not fully till the consummation of the world: He also enlargeth the territories and bounds of his Kingdom, that he might fulfil the prophesies, and make good his Fathers gift. *Psal.* 2. *I have given thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession.*

This

This is that kingdom, which is in the new Testament so often called the kingdom of God, and of heaven; this is that kingdom which in the resurrection Christ will deliver up to God his Father, 1 Cor. 15.

He cannot yet digest (cap. 44.) the souls immortality, for three reasons. [*First, because the tree of life was to preserve man immortal. Secondly, what needed Christs sacrifice to recover mans immortality, if he hath not lost it: Thirdly, must the wicked and heathen also enjoy eternal life.*] I answer, The tree of life was to preserve man immortal, but not the soul which is immortal by nature, as being a spirit, and not subject to corruption, as bodies which are compounded of corruptible materials, and of contrary elements. Secondly, Christs sacrifice was to recover mans immortality, but not the souls which was not lost; now as a part cannot be the whole, nor the whole a part; so neither can the soul be man, nor man the soul. Thirdly, eternal life which the wicked enjoy, is a life of misery, and such as they would be willing to exchange for death, neither is it more strange that wicked men should enjoy eternal life, then wicked Angels; both enjoying this immortality, as a due punishment for their sins. now whereas he saith, [*That eternal life was not essential to humane nature, but consequent to the vertue of the tree of life.*] I grant, that man is not naturally immortal; yet the soul of man is; but I deny that life eternal was a consequent to the vertue of any tree; for no tree can be capable of such a vertue; neither was the tree of life any other then a Sacrament of mans immortality, if he had persevered in his obedience; therefore God debarred him, because of his transgression, from it; in that he would not have his Sacraments abused by profane hands,

hands. But he tells us, [*That when everlasting death is called everlasting life in torments, it is a figure never used but in this very case.*] I answer, That this figure is used in other cases; as when Christ saith, *Let the dead go bury the dead*; there natural life is called death: So when the Apostle saith, *We were dead in our sins and trespasses*: he used the same figure in another case; for there the delight we have in sin is called death; this figure is used in the law in another case, for captives, slaves, prisoners, and such like miserable men, are said to be civily dead: *St. Paul* in another case useth this figure, when he saith, *I am crucified*; that is, dead to the world; to wit, in his affections; and so they who include themselves in a monastery, are said to be dead to the world. But he saith, that this doctrine of the souls immortality [*is founded onely on some of the obscurer places of the new Testament.*] I pray, what obscurity is there in this place, *Thou shalt be this night with me in Paradise*? What was to be with Christ in Paradise, not the good thiefs body, then it must needs be his soul? So when Christ preached to the spirits in prison, what were these spirits? Shaddows onely, or fancies, such as *Virgil* speaks of: *Umbræ ibant tenues, simulachraque luce carentum.* Bodies they could not be, they must needs then be souls: So when Christ saith, *That body and soul shall be cast into hell fire*, there cannot be meant, as Mr. *Hobbs* expounds it, body and life; for then Christ should speak non-sence, when he saith; *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, Mat.* 10. 28. That is, fear not them that can take away the life of the body, but are not able to take away the life of the life. But he objecteth, [*That the soul in Scripture is taken sometimes for the whole man, or living creature.*] I grant it is so taken some-

ſometimes Synecdochically; will it therefore follow that it is never taken properly? So this word *fleſh* is ſometimes tropically uſed for the whole man, is therfore never uſed properly.

He tells us, (*cap.*44.) [*That this window gives entrance to the dark doctrine of eternal torments, of purgatory, of walking ghoſts, and exorciſms.*] The doctrine of eternal torments is not ſo dark, as he takes it; it is in plain termes ſet down in Scripture, to be an eternal ſeparation from God, everlaſting fire, everlaſting ſhame, and contempt, *&c.* Neither is it a doctrine either erroneous or dangerous, that we ſhould for fear of teaching it, deny the ſouls immortality; ſuppoſe alſo, that the doctrine of pugatory, walking ghoſts and exorciſms were erroneous, and grounded on the ſouls immortality; muſt we deny this for for fear of theſe errors? Muſt we deny the Scriptures, becauſe they have been windows to give entrance to divers hereſies? What doctrine is ſo ſound, orthodox, and true, which is not abuſed by wanton, luxurious and pernitious wits? As for ghoſt walking, that has no relation to the ſouls immortality; for if by ghoſt he meant the ſoul; that walked uſually among the Gentiles, till the body was buried a hundred years, as *Vrigil* ſaith: *Centum errant annos*, and then it reſted in the grave with the body, as Mr. *Hobbs* would have it; So *Virgil* ſpeaks of the ſoul of *Polidorus*, Aen.3. *Animamque ſepulcro condimus*; and of *Deiphobus*, *magna manes ter voce vocavi*, *Aen.*6. His ſoul was called upon by *Aneas* to come to his grave. Again, this ghoſt walking was neither of the ſoul, nor of the body, but of the ſhaddow, image, phancy, or ſimilitude of the body. So *Aen.*4, *Omnibus umbra locis adero*, ſaith Queen *Dido*. So on her death bed ſhe ſpeaks, *Magna mei ſub terras ibit imago*

So-

So the ſhaddow and ſimilitude of *Creuſa* appeared to *Aenaas*, *Infelix ſimulachrum, Atque ipſius umbra Creuſæ, Aen.2.* So *Lucretius* out of *Ennius*, who were no great friends to the ſouls immortality, held that neither the ſoul nor the body went to hell, but onely the ſhaddows or ſimilitudes of men.

Et ſi preterea tamen eſſe Acherunſia templa
Ennius æternis exponit verſibus, edens,
Quo neq; permanent animæ, neq; corpora noſtra:
Sed quædam ſimulachra modis pallentia miris.

Lucr. l. 1.

When Chriſt ſaith, *Mar.9.1. There be ſom that ſtand here who ſhall not taſt of death, till they have ſeen the Kingdom of God come with power.* This Kingdom Mr. *Hobbs* [*will have to be ſpoken of Chriſts transfiguration.*] I know ſome of the Ancients were of this opinion; but it is very improbable that Chriſt ſhould call a viſion, the Kingdom of God; and a Kingdom with power: therefore it is more likely, that he meant the kingdom of grace, or of his Church, which began to ſpread after his reſurrection, with power, when at the preaching of fiſher-men the world began to ſubmit to the ſcepter of Chriſt: which ſome that ſtood there, that is, the Apoſtles ſaw, before they taſted of death: who are called *ſome*, in reſpect of the people, who alſo ſtood there, as may be ſeen, *Mark* 8.34. Again, whereas Chriſts kingdom began at his reſurrection. Mr. *Hobbs* demands [*a reaſon, why Chriſtians ever ſince pray, thy kingdom come.*] The reaſon is, becauſe that kingdom we pray for, is not yet come, to wit, the kingdom of Glory; nor is the kingdom of Grace totally come, or in its full plenitude, becauſe all nations are not as yet ſubdued to Chriſts Scepter.

He gives us (*cap.*44.) a pretty interpretation

of

of *Solomons* words, *Eccles.* 12 7. *The spirit shall return to God that gave it*, [*That is* (saith he) *God only knows* (*but not man*) *what becomes of mans spirit when he expireth.*] This interpretation is somewhat far fetched: which if it be allowed, the word of God will prove no better then a nose of wax. When *Luke* 8.55. the rulers daughter being dead, it is said, her spirit returned to her again; the meaning must be, according to Mr. *Hobbs* his interpretation, that her spirit did not indeed return, but onely she knew (and none but she) what became of it: So *Zach.* 1.16. *Thus saith the Lord, I am returned to* Jerusalem *with mercies*: The meaning is, that *Jerusalem* onely knew, what was become of God. Besides, when *Solomon* saith, *The dust shall return to the earth, and the spirit shall return unto God*: I would know, whether the dust truely, returns to the earth? if it returns, why doth not the soul truly return to God? Seeing with the same breath, the same phrase is uttered by *Solomon*: as for the question *Solomon* makes, *Eccles.* 3.21. *Who knoweth that the spirit of man goeth upward, and that the spirit of the beast goeth downward*; doth not sound so in the Hebrew; but thus: *Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward*: and so both the French and our last English translations have it, and so have the Latin *Geneva* version: The *Septuagints* read it thus: *Who hath seen the spirit of man*: and the *Geneva* translation hath; *who have observed the spirit.* So that *Solomon* questioneth not the immortality of the soul, but sheweth the difficulty of knowing the nature thereof, or the manner how it leaves the body, and mounteth upward towards heaven, the place of its original.

He proves (*cap.* 44.) [*there is no natural immortality of the soul*] by Solomon, Eccles. 3.19. *That which*

which befalleth the sons of man, befalleth beasts, as the one dyeth, so dyeth the other, they have all one breath, and a man hath no preheminence above a beast.] In these words *Solomon* doth not speak of the soul at all; but of the body onely, as may bee seen in the words immediately following. *All go into one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.* I hope he beleeves better of *Solomon*, then to make him speak so brutishly, as though mans divine soul were made of dust, and resolved into dust again: or as if there were no difference between mans soul and the breath of beasts. In respect then of our animal nature, or corporeal part, we eat, drink, sleep, breath, and dye like the beasts, but this concerns nothing at all the reasonable soul of man, by which he is specifically different from beasts. He saith, [*That* Enoch's *translation makes as much for the immortality of the body as of the soul.*] I deny it not, and therefore infer, That if it makes for the immortality of the body, much more makes it for the immortality of the soul; therefore this place of *Gen.*5.24. *Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him*; is alledged by Divines, to prove mans immortality after the resurrection. Again he saith, [*That this is a hard saying of* Solomons; *Better is he that hath not yet been, then they who have been, if the soul be immortal.*] But I say, that this saying is no waies hard; for better it is to have no being morally, then to have a miserable being: therefore the immortality of a wicked mans soul adds to his unhapiness. For this cause *Christ* saith of *Judas*, *That it had been good for him, if he had never been born.* Besides, when *Christ* tels us, *That God is the God of Abraham*, &c. and therefore *Abraham* was then alive; Mr. *Hobbs* saith, [*That Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were then alive by promise, not actually.*] but I would

would fain know when did God make such a promise to *Abraham*; that his soul should live immortally, and that he should be raised to immortality in the last day. Again, how can one be said to live by promise, who is actually dead; How is God the God of the living, if they whose God he is be not living, but actually dead; for a dead man to live by promise is a bull.

Cap. 44. [*He cannot finde, that any man shall live in torments everlastingly.*] What doth he say to that place, *Rev.* 20. 10. *Where the beast and false prophet are tormented with the Devil day and night for ever and ever.* Do not they live in torments everlastingly, that live in everlasting shame and contempt: but such is the condition of the wicked, *Dan.*12.2. *They shall be punished with everlasting destruction*, or perdition, 2 *Thes.*1.9. But [*it seems hard to him, that God the Father of mercies should punish without any end of time*, &c. If God were not the Father of justice, as well as of mercy, it would go hard with good men; but *it is just with God to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you*, saith the Apostle: *And to you that are troubled, peace with us*, 2 *Thess.*1.6,7. God who is offended is eternal, the desires of wicked men to sin are eternal, *Voluissent reprobi sine fine vivere, ut possent sine fine peccare.* The reward of the godly is eternal; why then should not the torments of wicked men be eternal? But I will answer him, as St. *Austin* answereth the Originists. *Tanto errat perversius quanto videtur de Deo sentire clementius*, Their error must needs be too pernitious, that maketh God too gratious. Again, to what end did God prepare an everlasting fire, if the wicked be not everlastingly tormented in it? But to this he answers: [*That there never may want wicked men to be tormented in them, though not every, nor any one eternally*;

eternally; for the wicked being left in the estate they were in after Adam's *sin, may at the resurrection live as they did, marry, and give in marriage and engender perpetually, for there is no place of Scripture to the contrary.*] When the Scripture speaks of wicked mens eternal torments, it never speaks of any redemption thence, and Mr. *Hobbs* confesseth, that the Reprobates, who dye in their sins, shall have no redeemer, they must then remain there for ever; except they had a Redeemer to help them out thence. Besides, I shewed that the false prophet is tormented for ever, and we read, *Rev.* 4. That if any one man shall worship the beast, the smoke of his torment shall ascend for evermore. As for leaving the wicked in the estate they were in after *Adams* fall, is a doctrine well beseeming the school of *Mahomet*, not of Christ: it seems also by this doctrine, that at the resurrection shall be the revolution of the Platonick year, when all things shall be acted in this world, as they were in the beginning: After *Adam*'s fall, men did marry, build, plant, tread, eat, drink, and solace themselves with divers delights, if the wicked shall do the same after the resurrection, they shall be in as good a condition, as the Musalmans in *Mahumets* Paradise, or the Gentiles in the *Elysian* fields.

——— quæ gratia currûm
Armorumq; fuit vivis, quæ cura nitentes
Pascere equos eadem sequitur tellure repostos.

Virg. *Æn.* 6.

If this doctrine of yours be admitted, who will for bear wickedness and profanness, knowing that he shall be after this life in the same condition *Adam* was after his fall, who will not be content rather to embrace that condition, after he hath glutted himself here

with the pleasures of sin; then to endure all miseries and persecution, deny himself, and take up the cross of Christ, to enjoy unknown happiness which the eye hath not seen, nor the ear heard of: But when you say that there is no Scripture contrary to marriage after the resurrection; I would know whether there be any Scripture for it. Why may not *Judas Iscarios* marry with some Princes daughter, and by this means obtain a crown, you can alledge me no Scripture against it; but I can alledge you Scripture against marriage; *In the resurrection*, saith Christ, *men neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are like the Angels of God*, that is, without copulation as they are. Now St. *Matthew* speaks not these of the resurrection of the just onely, but of the resurrection in general; and so doth St. *Luke*; though you would have him speak onely of the resurrection of just men: for all men shall rise to life eternal; all men in their celibat shall be like the Angels: as men shall and may be called the children of the resurrection, and consequently of God: as all men, even the Devils, are the sons of God by creation: for as he gave to all men a beeing in the creation, so he will give to all men a new beeing in the resurrection. To be brief, that the punishment of wicked men shall be eternal, is plain by this argument; they only are pardoned who repent; the wicked after this life cannot repent, therefore they cannot be pardoned: besides our Saviour tels us, that *he who speaketh against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come*: if then there be no remission of sin, there can be no relaxation of punishment, for the one depends upon the other.

In his 45 Chap. he undertakes to shew, *That those evill*

evil spirits or Devils wch Christ cast out of the possessed, were not such, but diseases. Sure if this opinion be true, then Christ did no great matter in curing of ordinary diseases. But the Scripture tels us, that *He came to destroy death, and him who hath the power of death*, which is the Devill, that the prophesie in Paradise might be fulfilled, *The seed of the woman shall tread down the Serpents head.* These were strange diseases that could speak to, & question Christ, *Art thou come to torment us before our time?* and could beseech him to have leave to enter into the Herd of Swine. Our Saviour did not know so much as Mr. *Hobbs*, that Devils were but diseases, when he gave commission to his Disciples, *Matth.* 10. and *Luke* 9. not onely to cure diseases, but also to cast out Devils. And *Matth.* 4. 24. Christ not onely cured divers diseases and torments, and healed such as were lunatick, and had the palsie, but those also which were possessed with Devils; by which we see Diseases and Devils are different things. But he saith, *That the addressing of Christs command to madness or lunacy, is no more improper then was his rebuking of the Fever, or the wind and Sea.* I answer, It's true, Christs speaking to those inanimate things, was onely to shew the power and efficacie of his Word; so in the Creation God is introduced by *Moses* as if he had spoken to the creatures; but it were very absurd to think that diseases should speak and discourse with Christ; should question and beseech him, and acknowledge his Divinity, as these Devils did. But he proceeds and says, *That he hath not observed out of Scripture, that any man was ever possessed with any other corporeal spirit but that of his own.* That some men have been possessed with other spirits besides their own, is plain by many places of Scripture; but whether these spirits were cor-

poreall or incorporeall, is not the question, though neither Divinity nor Philosophy doth acknowledge any corporeall spirits properly: The Wind indeed is sometimes called a Spirit, and so is the Sun, but the word *Spirit* is there used improperly, and in a large sense; so are these subtile vapours in the Nerves and Arteries called Animal and Vitall Spirits by the Physicians, though indeed they be bodies. Now that Spirits properly so called, such as Angels and Mens souls cannot be corporeall, is plain, because they have not quantity, nor are in a place by circumscription, nor move Physically. Many Angels may be in the same *ubi*, a legion of spirits, that is 6500 may be in the same man; and yet Mr *Hobbs* cannot observe, that ever any man hath been possessed with any other spirit then that of his own. Besides, if Spirits were corporeall, their bodies must be either Homogeniall or Heterogeniall. Not Homogenial; for different operations, such as are in Angels, require different organs. Not Heterogenial; for so we must make Angels and the souls of men to be composed of different and contrary entities, and consequently subject to dissolution and corruption. All which are grosse absurdities. Again, Angels can passe through grosse bodies without penetration of dimensions, which shew they have not quantity, and consequently are immateriall: For the purest body that is cannot passe through another, but the other body must yeeld & give place. Lastly, if there were not incorporeall spirits, [the world would be imperfect, as being destitute of incorporeall substances, which with the corporeall make up the Universe, and compleat it.

He saith (*Chap.* 45) [*That Christ went himself into the wilderness, and that this carrying of him up and down from the wilderneſſe to the City, and from thence into*

into a mountain, was a vision] I know he went of himself to be tempted, he being no wayes forced, but of his own accord undertook to buckle with Satan our Arch-enemy, that we might the more boldly enter with him. Yet tho. Scripture saith, *That he was led by the spirit*; but I cannot admit that this temtation of Christ was but a vision: for then we shall have small comfort by Christs temtation, if it were not reall but imaginary, or in a vision; and if we shall admit this to be a vision, we may suspect the rest of his sufferings to be but visions, to the great dishonor of our Saviour and his Evangelists who wrot his History, and also to the discomfort of all Gods children. But how came Mr *Hobbs* to be so wise as to know this to be a vision, of which the Evangelists make such an exact historicall narration? When in Scripture any thing is done in a dream or vision, the dream or vision is mentioned; as the Angell appeared to *Joseph* in a dream, *Matth.* 2. *Peter* saw a sheet let down from heaven in a vision, *Acts* 10. The wise men were warned by the Angell in a dream, *Matth.* 2.. *Paul* saw the man of *Macedonia* in a vision, *Acts* 11. The Lord spake to *Paul* in a vision, *Acts* 18. but in this temtation of Christ there is no mention of any vision, therefore we conclude it was reall; and in saying so we need not fear that either Christ was possessed, or carried away violently by the devill, as Mr. *Hobbs* would infer; because our Savviour for our comfort and salvation, suffered himselfe to be both tempted and carried by the devill, as afterward he permitted himselfe to be apprehended, and scourged, and crucified by the devils instruments. And albeit Satan could not from that high mountain shew to the Lord all the kingdomes of the world, yet he could point to the understanding their places and situation.

He

He is offended (cap. 45.) [*That the use of exorcism hath hitherto so prevailed in the Church by the doctrine of incorporeal spirits.*] Incorporeal spirits are no more the cause of exorcisms, then corporeal substances are: ἐξορκίζειν is but to adjure, and adjuration is used as well against men as spirits; the high Priest did not think that Christ when he stood before him was an incorporeal spirit, yet he adjureth or exorciseth him by the living God, *Mat.* 26. He tells us, [*That there were many Demoniacks in the Primitive Church, and few mad men; whereas now there are many mad-men, and few Demoniacks, which proceeds not from the change of nature, but of names.*] That the use of exorcism hath so prevailed in the Church, should administer cause of comfort, not of grief; in that our Saviour hath not left his Church destitute of helps and arms against the devil, who takes delight to torment men here, by possessing their bodies, and to torment them hereafter, by insinuating into their souls, inticing them to consent to all kinde of iniquity, that so he may bring them, with himself, into eternal misery. Now our Saviour was the chief exorcist himself, for he by his power and word cast out devils, this gift he bestowed on his Apostles, that they should cast out devils in his name; and therefore the Disciples, after they were sent abroad by Christ, and had returned, rejoyced that the devils were subject to them: and this gift of exorcism was bestowed sometimes on wicked men, as we may see *Mat.* 7. of those, who in the last day will say to Christ, *We have cast out devils in thy name.* And we read *Acts* 19. of the 7. sons of *Sceva*, who took upon them to exorcise evil spirits in the name of the Lord Jesus, because *Paul* had practised exorcism with such good success. We see how the spi-

rit

rit of divination by Paul's command in the name of Jesus Christ came out of the damosel, *Acts* 16. Exorcism then is a gift of God, not temporary to continue onely in the Apostles, but lasting, and to remain in the Church till the end of the world, otherwise we should be in a sad condition: if when Satan possesseth any of her members, there were no remedy against him; but we have remedies left us, to wit, fasting and prayer, for our Saviour tells us, that there is a kinde of devil which is not cast out but by prayer and fasting *Matt.* 16. Now that there are some possessed in these latter daies, is apparent by divers histories that mention strange effects of people possessed, which are more then natural, and at which Physitions are amazed; for as their diseases are preternatural, so be their cures; *Melancthon* in his Epistles tells us of a woman in his time, who lived in *Saxonie*, she being possessed by the devil, in her fits would speak Greek and Latin sentences, which she never before had heard. She foretold the *Saxon* war in these words, ἔσται ἀνάγκη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὀργὴ ἐν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, that is, There will be tribulation upon the earth, and wrath in this people. He mentions another Demoniack, who by the prayers of the congregation was freed from the devil, which at certain times used to torment her; I could allegde many examples of modern Demoniacks out of *Del Rio*, *Wierus*, *Bodin*, *Zacuta*, *Gaulars* memorable histories, and others, which physick could not cure, but were cured by Christian exorcisms, that is, by prayers, fastings, and almes of the Congregation. *Demones a nobis adjurantur & torquentur: spiritualibus flagris & orationis flagellis exire coguntur.* We adjure and torment the devils: our spiritual whips & scourging prayers force them to go out;

saith *Lactantius*. I know some superstitious ceremonies have been and are still used in exorcisms, which I allow not: but I do not like Mr. *Hobbs* his slighting of Christs miracles, and his Apostles, when he tells us, [*That Demoniacks were many in the primitive Church, and few mad-men, whereas now there are many mad-men and few Demoniacks, which proceed not from the change of nature.* Is not this to extenuate Christs miracles, who came to destroy the works of the devil, and to cast out the prince of this world. And is it not likewise to make the Evangelists impostors, in publishing those cures for miraculous which were not, and calling ordinary and natural diseases by the termes of devils and evil spirits?

He will not (*cap.* 45.) have it Satan that entred into *Judas*, though St. *Luke* writes so, [*But an hostile and trayterous intention of selling Christ, for as by the holy Ghost are meant frequently graces and good inclinations, so by entring of Satan may be understood wicked cogitations.*] To Mr. *Hobbs*, Satan is any thing, so he may not be a spirit or incorporeal substance. Sometimes he is but a fancy, shaddow, dream, or apparition: sometimes is madness, palsy, lunacy, or any other melady; here he is a trayterous intention; but indeed there was more then a trayterous intention that entred into *Judas* at last: the intention to betray Christ was put into the heart of *Judas* by Satan, *John* 13.2. But when he had received the sop, Satan himself entered into him; and as St. *Austin* on that place saith, took full possession of him, *John* 13. 27. And though I should yeeld, that sometimes the holy Ghost is put for the graces of the spirit, yet it will not follow, that Satan is used in Scripture for any evil suggestion or intention: Again, Satan doth not presently intrude himself

himself into any man, but first prepares his way by his Harbingers, that is, suggestions and evil thoughts, which having made the soul fit for him, he enters and takes possession, and thus he dealt with *Judas*: Again, I would know of Mr. *Hobbs*, whether it was Satan in the Serpent, or onely a treacherous intention, that moved him to speak and seduce *Eve*? Lastly, why should we take his bare word for Gospel, and prefer this his whimsie to the belief of the whole Church, and the streame of all interpreters?

In his forty sixth chapter he spurnes at all learning except his own, and that with such a magisterial spirit, and so supercilious scorn, as if *Aristotle*, *Plato*, *Zeno*, the Peripateticks, Academicks, Stoicks, Colledges, Schooles, Universities, Synagogues, and all the wise men of *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Affrick* hitherto, were scarce worthy to carry his books: With him [*Logick is but captions of words*, Aristotles *Metaphisicks are absurd, his politicks repugnant to government, his Ethicks ignorant, the Natural Philosophy of the Schooles is a dream, rather then a science, set forth in senseless and insignificant language*; Aristotles *Philosophy is vain*,] and many such like expressions; which shews how little he hath of the spirit of humility and modesty: I finde not too much learning, but too much pride makes some men mad: true learning is alwaies joyned with humility; the deepest rivers, saith *Seneca*, make the least sound; the Cypress tree is tall but fruitless; the Apple-tree is low but fruitful; and the more its laden the more it stoops: that man that slights all but himself, will be slighted of all but himself; intemperance in words argue imporency of minde; and as the Court saith, He is an unjust man that prefers his own wit to all others. [*Homine imperito nihil quid-*

quam injustius, qui nisi quod ipse facit, nil rectum putat.] He cannot but fowle his own hands that casteth dirt in the face of his betters. Every wise man will employ his eyes at home; will look upon the wallet that hangs at his own back; will descend into himself, and then he shall see how small cause he hath to despise other mens gifts, when he considereth the defects of his own: [*Tecum habita, & disces quam sit tibi curta supellex.*] He that thinks to rear up the imaginary tower of his own fame upon the ruins of other mens, will finde he builds upon a sandy foundation, and indeed makes castles in the air. St. *Austins* counsel is good in this case; He that will build high, must lay his foundation low; [*Si vis magnam fabricam construere celsitudinis, de fundamento prius incipe humilitatis.*] *Hercules* cannot be pulled down by pigmies; nor can the rocks be shaken, though the frothy waves beat against them. Eminent men like solid trees, the more they are shaken, the stronger they grow, saith *Seneca*, [*Quid mirabis bonos viros, ut confirmentur concuti? Non est arbor solida nec fortis, nisi in quam frequens ventus incursat, ipsa enim vexatione constringitur, & radices certius figit.*] We are bound to acknowledge, with thankfulness, the paines and industry of those brave men, which have inricched us with such monuments of learning, which the Universities of the world have received, and do to this day cherish and maintain with such applause; and not to requite them with scorn and contempt: this is ingratitude in the highest degree: I wish therefore that Mr. *Hobbs* had used more solidity in his arguments, and less impotency in his expressions against those eminent lights of learning, and not with *Leviathan* [*to cast against them smoak out of his nostrils, as out of a seething Pot or Caldron.*] To use the word

of

of God in *Job*; for I doubt me, Mr. *Hobbs* will never be brought in competition with *Aristotle*; but now let us receive his accusation against *Aristotles* Philosophy.

He saith, (*cap.* 46.) [*That this doctrine of separated essences will fright men from obeying the laws of their Country.*] I should think, rather that this doctrine would fright men from disobeying the laws; for if God commands obedience to the laws, and subjection to the higher powers, is it likely that he will permit spirits to walk to dissuade men from obedience? Or will the spirits of those holy men, who taught subjection to Magistrates whilst they were alive, teach the contrary when they are dead? Again, wise men have urged obedience to their laws, upon the doctrine of separated spirits: so did *Moses* by shewing his laws came from God, who is a separated essence; so did *Lycurgus*, *Solon*, *Numa*, *Mahomet* and others. But saith he, [*Upon this ground, faith, wisdom, and other vertues are sometimes poured into a man, and blown into him from heaven, as if the vertuous and their vertues could be asunder.*] That faith, wisdom, & other graces are sometimes poured into or upon men, is no paradox in divinity, seeing Gods word which cannot lie assureth us thereof; *I will pour my spirit upon all flesh*, *Joel* 2. *I will pour upon the house of David the spirit of grace and supplication*, *Zech.* 12. God poured his gifts upon the Gentiles, *Acts*, 10. And so the Scripture useth the word, blowing or breathing, or inspiring, which is all one thing: all Scripture is by divine inspiration, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. Men spoke in old time, as they were inspired, or blown into by the holy Ghost, 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. And I pray, what dangerous or absurd doctrine is it to say, bee cause mens souls are immortal and immaterial, God inspireth from heaven his,

his gifts into them; but indeed the souls immortality is not the ground why God inspireth his graces, for then he would inspire the most wicked souls that are with his graces, for they are also immortal; the ground then of this inspiration is his own good pleasure, being a free dispenser of his gifts, neither needs he fear, that we by this doctrine will make the vertuous and their vertues to be asunder; for the vertues of vertuous men are not theirs till they be bestowed. Again, he saith: [*Who will endeavour to obey the laws, if he expects obedience to be poured into him.*] I reply, who will expect obedience to be poured into him, if he endeavour to obey the law. Again, obedience is an act of the will; now acts are not infused but habits. Besides, I answer him with *Thomas*; every good man yeelds obedience to Magistrates, because he is bound thereto by the law of nature, where we see inferiour movers obey the motion of the superiour, and likewise by the law of God, which teacheth him to be subject to principalities and powers, and to obey magistrates, *Tit.* 3.1. To submit himself *to every ordinance of man for the Lords sake, whether it be the King as supreme, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by Him,* 1 Pet. 2.13. A good man hath faith and he knows that faith in Christ includes obedience, for Christ himself taught obedience, both By precept and practise: he is also a just man, and justice requires that he should give to every man his due, but obedience is due to superiours; obedience then needs no inspiration, but such reasons; now if any will maintain erroneous opinions, as he alledgeth upon the doctrine of the souls immortality, who can help it? Men may build stuble and hay upon the best foundation, which is Christ Jesus as the Apostle sheweth. Shall we deny the

souls

souls immortality, because of some errors grounded thereon; then by the same reason deny the Scripture, deny Christ himself.

He laughs (*cap.* 45.) at the words *circumscriptive* and *definitive* used in the schooles, which he saith [*are insignificant words, for the circumscription of a thing, is nothing else but the defining of its place.*] Here he sheweth his ignorance in the school termes; for though circumscribing be the defining of a thing, yet the defining or confining is not the circumscribing thereof; Angels are in a place or rather space *definitive*, because they are so confined to one *ubi*, that they cannot at the same instant be in another, yet without any circumscription of parts, to the parts of the superficies in the ambient body or place; for in a spirit there are no parts, therefore no circumscription, though there is a confining or definition to the *ubi*: when we say, that all the soul is in every part of the body; he asks, [*Whether God is served with such absurdities.*] He should first prove this to be an absurdity, and then inform us, whether this tenet of the souls indivisibility, be any part of Gods worship; but indeed it is no more absurd to say, that the soul is all in *every* part of the body; then to say, that the Sun or moon is all in every mans eye; for one part of the Sun is not in my eye, and another part in your eye; but all the Sun is in my eye, and all the Sun is in millions of eyes at the same instant of time. He would have us tell him, [*How an incorporeal substance is capable of torment and pain in hell fire.*] The question is not *how*, but *whether or not* the soul be capable of pain; if you doubt of this, put your finger in the fire, and tell me if your soul be not capable of pain or grief, which is a torment. I shewed before out of *Austin*, that God hath a way

to torment souls in fire, though unknown to us; neither can we tell, how the soul goeth hence without the body into heaven; onely we can tell him, that when our bodies return to dust, our souls return to God that gave them, *Eccles.* 12. As for the School-men at which he carps, I deny not but there are, in some mens opinions, many needless questions, and subtilties, so there are likewise among them many excellent passages, and useful distinctions; in this life there is no perfection; where gold is there is dross; and the best corn is not without chaff; he is a fool that will refuse to drink wine, because there be lees in the barrel.

He saith, (*cap.* 46.) [*That what is written in the Metaphysicks, is for the most part repugnant to natural reason.*] He should have given us some instances that we might have answered him, but to speak of things in general, is to say nothing: yet that the Reader may perceive both the use of Metaphysicks, and how consonant that knowledge is to natural reason, I will set down here a few Metaphysical maximes. 1. One entity hath but one specifical essence. 2. The essence receiveth not augmentation nor diminution. 3. As every thing desireth to preserve its entity, so it doth its unity. 4. Unity is before multitude. 5. Truth is consonant to truth. 6. Every entity is good. 7. Beauty excites affection. 8. Evil is not appetible. 9. Every thing compounded is dissoluble. 10. Whatsoever is compounded hath parts and principles. 11. In an universe is contained all particulars. 12. The whole is greater then the parts. 13. The first entity is simply infinite. 14. The abstract is before the concret. 15. The measure is before the thing measured. 16. The subject is the matter of its accident. 17. The

cause

cause is before the effect. 18. Nothing can be its own cause. 19. As the essence so the knowledge of the effect depends from the cause. 20. The proximate cause being put, the effect follows. 21. The end moveth the efficient. 22. The end presupposeth the means. 23. A voluntary cause is free and indifferent, so is not the natural cause. 24. The matter is capable of forms. 25. The The form is the cause of distinction and determination. 26. The generical unity is less then the specifical, and this then the numerical. 27. Identity is founded upon unity, &c. Many more I could set down, but these are sufficient to let us see how much Mr. *Hobbs* is deceived, in saying, Metaphysick is repugnant to natural reason.

He tells us, (*cap.* 46.) [*That every part of the universe is body, and that which is not body, is no part of the universe.*] If he speaks of integral parts, I grant what he saith; but if he means by parts that which we call essential; to wit, matter and form, I deny them to be bodies. His drift is to infer that souls are bodies, because parts; but I deny them to be parts, no more then the vital and animal spirits are parts of the arteries and nerves that contain them; or wine a part of the vessel that holds it. Spirits are contained in the world, but are no parts of it. But when he saith, [*That that which is no part of the universe is nothing, and consequently no where.*] He will make God to be nothing, and no where; for I hope he will not make him a part of the universe, nor will he make him corporeal. He carps at *Aristotle* [*for defining heaviness to be an endeavour to go to the center of the earth,*] *Aristotle* doth not make this a definition, but a description of heaviness; for indeed the essential forms of inanimate things are not easily

to

to be found by man in this life, in which our best science is but ignorance; therefore the Philosophers differ so much in this very thing, of gravity and levity, some holding them to be forms of the elements, and causes of motion; others hold them to be passive principles onely of motion, and that the mover is the generator, which hath left an impression in light and heavy bodies to ascend and descend: some hold gravity and levity to be substances, others but accidents; but however the peripatetick's have gone as far as reason and the light of nature can direct them. God will not in this world have us to know all things; our clearest light here is but a glimmering: but if this description of *Aristotles* please not Mr. *Hobbs*, he should have done well to have given us a better, and then we will turn his disciples: but its more easie to carp, then mend or immitate: *Carpere vel noli nostra, vel ede tua.*] So he laughs at Philosophers for saying, *stones or metals have a desire, or can discern the place they would be at, as man doth.*] But he laughs at his own shaddow, for Philosophers grant, that in inanimate things, there is a natural appetite to move towards their own place, which is nothing else but an inclination or disposition, which he cannot deny, except he will deny nature it self: but that stones can discern as man does, is his own dream, not the saying of Philosophers, for they teach the contrary; to wit, that this natural desire or aptitude is without all knowledge or discerning; by this he shews, how little he is acquainted with their writings.

Philosophers tell us, that in condensed matter, there is less quantity then before, and rarefied when more. Upon this he asks, (*cap.* 46.) [*If there can be matter that hath not some determined quantity,*

tity, or if a body were made without any quantity at all.] I answer no; for the quantity is an inseparable comitant of matter, so that it increaseth & decreaseth as the matter doth. A body can be no more without quantity, then fire without heat. Experience teacheth us, that as any thing shrinks, and thickneth, it decreaseth in quantity, and so it increaseth as it is extended and rarified: He carps at the souls infusion, at the cause of sense, at the cause of willing, at occult qualities, and at some other peripatetick tenets, at which he onely shews his teeth: not being able to bite them; save onely that he calls this vain Philosophy, affirming the same out of St. *Pauls* words; but indeed St. *Paul* never called Philosophical truths vain, for so he should condemn divinity, to which Philosophy is subservient: besides, truth cannot be repugnant to truth; and Philosophy is one of Gods special gifts, by which even the Gentiles were brought to the knowledge of God, and made inexcusable; there are vain opinions among some professors of Philosophy, as there are among some Divines: must therefore Philosophy or Divinity be condemned as vain: he that speaks against Philosophy doeth both bewray his ignorance and malice; in disparaging men for making use of those arms which God hath given us to fight withall against the enemies of truth; and to destroy the field of good corn, because the envious man hath sown some tears among them. To speak against Philosophy, is to speak against the light of reason, which God hath kindled in our mindes.

But he calls it (*cap.* 42.) [*vain Philosophy to say that God is no cause at all of injustice.*] To free God from injustice, is not vain Philosophy, but true Divinity; whereas the opinion of Mr. *Hobbs* is the

the hereſie of the Libertines, who made God the author of ſin; or of the Manichees and Valentimans, who held, that God made ſin. But I would know, how can the fountain of juſtice be in any ſort the cauſe of injuſtice: or can he be the author of ſin, that is the puniſher of ſin; that makes laws againſt it, that invites upon promiſe of reward all men from it: how can he be free from hypocriſie, that grieves and is angry for ſinful actions, whereof he is the cauſe himſelf? How can he hate injuſtice, if he be the cauſe of it; he muſt needs love his own work, and conſequently ſinful actions? How can God deface his own work by ſin, or his own image in man? How can it be otherwiſe but man muſt delight in ſin without remorſe, when he knows that God is any wiſe the cauſe thereof? Therefore to make God at all the cauſe of injuſtice, is in effect to make him no God. It ſtands then well with Philoſophy and Divinity alſo to ſay, God is not at all the author of ſin; he permits it indeed for his glory, for the exerciſe of his ſervants, and the condemnation of the obſtinate ſinners; but is no more the cauſe of it, then the rider is the cauſe of that lameneſs in his horſe, which proceeds from his own unrulineſs; or the Sun the cauſe of ſtinke, which ariſeth of putrifaction. Again, this which he cals vain Philoſophy, is it which brings us to the knowledge of divine and humane things, which perfects the will by uniting it to goodneſs, and the intellect by uniting it to truth.

It's ridiculous what he ſaith of Good and Evil, to wit, [*That it is not the appetite of privat men, but the law, which is the will and appetite of the State, that is the meaſure of good and evill.*] He makes here two different appetites, the one of the State, which is the Law, and the other of private men;

but

but I say the appetite both of State and privat men, is one and the same: For if it had not been the appetite of privat men to have a Law, how could there have been any? Can a King make a law by himself without his people which consisteth of privat men. Again, if not the appetite of privat men but the law of the State is the measure of good, what shall we say of *Daniels* privat appetite to worship the God of heaven, and the publick law of *Nebuchadnezzar* in worshipping his Idoll? Was that law of the Jewish State which condemned Christ, the measure of good? Or the Roman law in persecuting the Christians? But he cannot yet leave barking at *Aristotle*, saying, [*That men have learned from his civill Philosophy to call all manner of Common-wealths but the popular, tyranny; and all Kings they call tyrants.*] Either he is very ignorant in *Aristotles Policicks*, or very malicious: For *Aristotle* both in his *Ethicks, lib. 8. cap. 10.* and in his *Politicks, lib. 3. cap. 5.* is so farre from calling Kings tyrants, and all Commonwealths but the popular tyranny, that he distinguisheth the Kingly from the Tyrannicall government, where in plain terms he saith, That the Kingly is of all governments the best, and the Tyrannicall of all worst, τῶν βελτίστη ἡ βασιλεία, &c. ἡ τυραννὶς χειρίστη, that is the worst, saith *Aristotle*, which is opposite to the best, therefore tyranny being παρεκβάσις, a trangression from Kingly government, and opposite to it, must needs be worst; he shews there that Kings aim at the publick good, but Tyrants meerly at their own benefit. A King governs according to the Laws, a Tyrant dominiers according to his will. Neither again doth he call all governments but the popular, tyranny, for he saith, that Aristocracie is one of the good governments because it

aims

aims at τὸ κοινὸν συμφέρον, the common utility If it doth not degenerate into Oligarchy, when a few of the richer sort will dominier and turn all the publick good to their own profit: and so he saith that *Politia*, or popular government is good if it degenerate not into Democracie, when the poorer sort (whereof there is the greater number) take upon them to invade the estates of the richer men, and convert them to their own use. By this we see how much *Aristotle* is wronged, and how far he is from calling any lawfull goverment tyranny, or Kings Tyrants, whereas he shews that a Tyrant is ἀνυπεύθυνος, one that will not be accountable for his government, but will doe what he pleaseth be it right or wrong, which is farre from the practice of Kingly government, which he compares to the government of a Father over his children.

He hath not yet done with *Aristotle*, (*Cap.* 46.) but accuseth him for saying, That in a well ordered Common-wealth not men should govern, but the laws, upon this he inferres, [*That every man who can write and read, finds himself governed by them he fears and believes can kill or hurt him when he obeyeth not.*] I pray what contradiction is there here? In a well governed Common-wealth men should obey the laws; In an ill governed Common-wealth men are forced out of fear to obey Tyrants. *Aristotle* speakes of a good not of a bad government, and sheweth what should be done, not what is done. Again, *Aristotle* sheweth that we should rather obey good laws then bad governors, and good governors rather then bad laws, *Polit. lib.* 3 *c.* 7. so that he will have us obey all, but withall tells us, that he who obeyeth bad laws, or bad governors, may be a good subject, but not a good man. Besides, his reasons are good why we

should

ſhould rather obey the law then the man, becauſe the Law is the Rule by which he ſhould govern. Secondly, becauſe the law is impartiall, and not ſubject to affections as men are, whom paſſions do ſo carry away, that either they underſtand not what is juſt, or if they do, they follow it not; yet he denieth not but in ſome caſes the man is rather to be obeyed then the law; to wit, when the law is obſcure and intricate, or when it is too ſevere and rigid. In ſuch caſes the governor that can interpret and mitigate the Law, is to be obeyed.

What he ſpeaks (*cap.* 46.) againſt privat ſpirits, and forcing of mens conſciences, I am not againſt, but his quarrell againſt the School-men for their barbarous termes, is needleſſe and witleſſe; for Philoſophers have liberty to uſe ſuch terms as may make them intelligible: And it is uſuall in all Arts and profeſſions both Liberall and Mechanicall: conſult with Phyſitians, Chymiſts, and Mathematicians, and you will find it ſo. For fictitious miracles I approve them not; but who can tell what is fictitious what not, of things done many hundred years agoe. As for the *Antipodes*, which ſome of the Fathers denied, I have in that poynt cleared them elſewhere; as likwiſe, I ſhewed the vanity of that whimzicall opinion of the earths motion, at large in that book called, *The new Planet no Planet*, and in that I writ in Latin againſt *Lanbergus* concerning his *Pythagorical Chymera*. If any would have further ſatiſfaction in that point, let them read what is written there; for I purpoſe not to boil Coleworts twice. And whereas Mr. *Hobbs* ſaith, *That it appears every day more and more, that years and dayes are determined by motions of the earth.*] It may be ſo in his fancy; but in the judgement of wiſe men it appeas leſſe and leſſe, and that it is the Sunne,

not

not the Earth, who like a Giant rejoyceth to run his course.

In his 47. chapter he goeth about to overthrow Christs Kingdom in this world, as being an invention of the Romanists and Presbyterians to uphold their own greatness. To this purpose he brings in many controverted doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, as the Popes power, succession and infallibility, the Clergies priviledges, their single life, auricular confessions, Purgatory, Canonization, Transubstantiation, &c. which have been ventilated and canvased *pro* and *con* by many learned men, and therefore I need not spend more paper about them. But whatever the benefit or pretence was which the Church of *Rome* had by maintaining that Christ had a Kingdom in this world, Mr *Hobbs* must be forced to acknowledge that Christ hath a Kingdom here already on earth, which began after his resurrection, or else he must deny Gods word, and his own too; for he confessed before that Christs Kingdome here was the Kingdom of grace. But to say that any, either *Romanist* or *Presbyterian*, doth hold Christs Kingdome here to be the Kingdome of glory, as Mr *Hobs* seemed in the beginning of this chapter to intimate, is to me altogether unknown, and I believe to him also. For he will find in their Writings, that the kingdom of glory is to be in Heaven after the generall Resurrection. Again, I would know how Christs kingdom on earth can be a Roman invention to uphold their greatnesse, whereas this doctrine was preached by Christ himself, by the Apostles and their successors, when they were under persecution, and had no greatnesse to uphold but their greatness in afflictions; then did they find that they were Kings & Priests to God; or as St. *Peter* calls them, a *Royall Priesthood*

head. Bu by the way I muſt let him ſee his error in ſaying, [That *Pontifex maximus* was an Officer ſubject to the Civill State.] This is not ſo, but the Civill State was ſubject to him, as *Feſtus* ſheweth in theſe words, *Pontifex maximus Judex & Arbiter rerum divinarum atque humanarum eſt.* He is Judge and Arbitrator both of Divine and Human things. So *Tully* confirms the ſame in his oration he made to the Pontifices for his houſe. *Majores noſtri vos & religionibus deorum immortalium & reipublicæ ſummæ præeſſe voluerunt.* They had, ſaith he, not only the chief charge of Religion, but alſo of the State. And ſhortly after, *Omnis Reipub. dignitas, omnium ſalus, vita, libertas, aræ, foci, Dii penates, bona fortunæ, domicilia, veſtræ ſapientiæ, fidei, poteſtatique commiſſa & credita eſſe videntur.* To their truſt & power was committed not only Religion, but alſo all things that concerned the Common-wealth. So *Dionyſius, lib.* 2. ſhewech that theſe Pontifices were *nullius poteſtati obnoxii*, ſubject to no power, nor were they to give an account of their actions either to the Senat or the People. They had the ſame honours which they were wont to give to their Kings, and more, for no man had the honor to be carried in a Chariot to the Capitoll, but onely the Pontifex; therefore this office and honor was ſo great, that *Numa* himſelf would be *Pontifex*, and ſo were divers Conſuls. *Julius Cæſar*, and the Emperours after him, diſcharged that Office themſelves, as holding it unfit that it ſhould be ſubject to any Civill power, but that it ſhould be incorporated in the ſupreme civil office.

Laſtly he tells us (*Chap.* 47.) [*That Ariſtotles Metaphyſicks, Ethicks, and Politicks, the frivolous diſtinctions, barbarous terms and obſcure language of the Schoolmen, ſerve to keep theſe errors from being deteſted.*] But in this he is as much deceived, as in his

other

other Tenets; for next to the Scripture, *Aristotles* Philosophy and School Divinity have been the greatest helps our men have had to detect those errors of our Adversaries which he hath mentioned. Our Modern Divines have made great use of these in handling their controversies, as may be seen easily by those that read them. As for School Divines, which he so much slights; because, it seems, he is little acquainted with them; we have reason to esteem well of their pains who with such dexterity and method have gathered together into brief sums and systems, the vast scattered and dispersed body of Divinity; and by that, short and witty distinctions in very significant and fit terms, though not *Ciceronian*, have dissolved many hard and knotty doubts. If the Civilians think themselves bound to *Justinian*, who reduced the vast and disordered volumes of the Law into short Institutions, Digests, and the Code; why should not Divines thank *Lumbard*, *Aquinas*, and other Schoolmen for their pains in contracting the voluminous works of the Greek and Latin Fathers into short and compendious methodical disputations.

In his Review he pleads for this discourse [*As not being contrary either to the word of God, or good manners, or to the disturbance of the publick Tranquillity*] How far this plea of his will extend and hold good, may be seen in the particulars of this my Answer. But I find now the reason why he hath so much inveighed against *Aristotle*, it seems he stands in his way, and keeps him back from attaining the honour of being read in the Universities; he told us before (*Chap.* 46). [*That seeing Aristotle is onely read there, that therefore this study is not to be called Philosophy, but Aristotelity.*] Now he says. [*That this his discourse may be profitably printed, and more profitably taught in the Universities.*] Can you blame him

him now for grumbling at *Ariſtotle*, whoſe brightneſs doth ſo much dazle his weak light, that he cannot be ſeen in the Colledges [*Suum cuiq; pulchrum.*] I know Apes and Crows think their own brood faireſt; who then can blame Mr. *Hobbs* for having ſo good a conceit of his *Leviathan*, who perhaps thinks [*That by his neeſings a light doth ſhine, and his eyes are like the eye-lids of the morning; that out of his mouth goe burning lamps, and ſparks of fire leap out.*] *Job* 41. But I doubt me for all this he will come ſhort of his expectation, and miſſe of his mark; it will not be an eaſie matter for Mr. *Hobbs* to juſtle *Ariſtotle* out of the Univerſities, nor to make *Malmsbury* ſo famous as *Stagira*, though his *Leviathan* were as ſtrong as *Jobs*, [*who eſteemeth Iron as ſtraw, and braſs as rotten wood.*] What is a Pigmy to encounter with *Hercules*? Shall the Beetle thruſt the Eagle out of his Neſt? There is no wiſe man will exchange the light of the Sun with that of a Candle. The *Jewes* have a fabulous Tradition, that *Leviathan* is of ſo vaſt a body, that he encompaſſeth the whole earth, and purſueth the Sun in his courſe, labouring to put out his light; *de te fabula narretur*, I think Mr. *Hobbs* hath the like conceit of his *Leviathan*, that it ſhall be diſperſed over all the world, and ſhall extinguiſh *Ariſtotle* the light of learning: But I think the Fable of one *Elias* a Jew will be fitter for him, he writes that *Leviathan* is a great Fiſh, laid up long ſince in Pickle, to be food for the juſt in the kingdom of the Meſſia here on earth. Mr. *Hobbs* expecteth ſuch a kingdom, therefore I think he cannot imploy his *Leviathan* better then to ſalt it againſt that day, that he with the other ſubjects of that imaginary kingdom may feaſt and make good cheer therewith. But in good earneſt I wiſh Mr. *Hobbs* had been more modeſt then to

slight so scornfully *Aristotle* and so many other eminent lights of learning; this was not the way to get reputation to his book among wise men. I will let him see the judgement not of all, but of a few, and those the primest men of this Age for learning and understanding concerning *Aristotle* and his obtrectators. *Aristotelem nonnulli mures è pistrina vexare adorti sunt alios omittam rugaces, quorum exclamationes videm in libellis* Scaliger Exercit. 307. *Barbara ingenia levissimis momentis impelluntur ad divini & incomparabilis herois obtrectationem; duæ namq; sunt aquilæ solæ in natura rerum: altera bellicæ laudis, altera literaniæ, illa potentiæ, hæc sapientiæ, Cæsar & Aristoteles; unicus Poetica Sytenophænix Virgilius, quibus obstrepunt & obclangunt inepti milvi, corvi, vultures etiam noctuæ atque vespertilliones,* Scal. Exerc. 194. *Aristoteles res naturales ac divinas dialecticamq; mirum in modum excoluit, animalium q; vitam, mores ac structuram incredibili sagacitate persecutus est, qui cum in singulis disciplinis scripserit quod probaretur, error tamen conspicuus in tot sæculis in illius scriptis deprehendi non potuit.* Cardan. de Subtil. l. 16. *Plurimum interest reipub. ut Aristoteles conservetur, & extet in Scholis, ac versetur in manibus discentium; nam profecto sine hoc authore non solum non retineri pura philosophia, sed ne quidem justa docendi aut discendi ratio ulla poterit.* Melancthon Epist. ad Eccium Cancellarium Bavaricum. *Aristotelis oratio propria & pura est, ita abundat quibusdam suis luminibus, ut Cicero eam dixerit, similem esse flumini aurum vehenti, & interdum ita dulcis est ut nihil possit cogitari dulcius.* Melancthon in relponsione pro Hermolao. *Aristoteles philosophorum, ne Platone quidem juxta, M. Tullum excepto, citra controversiam omnium doctissimus.* Erasmus in Epistola Johanni Maro. *Visum est Aristotelem totius philosophiæ principem & consummatorem tibi dicare ut in hujus penetralibus assidue versans,*

si

si quid deest orbi disciplinarum absolvas, &c. non injuria M. Tullius *haudquaquam stupidus ingeniorum æstimator hunc unum appellat aureum flumen, aptius mea sententia dicturus, totius sapientiæ ditissimum quendam mundum, &c. tam opulentus tam inestimabilis thesaurus urbis in totum perierat, nisi per* Lucium Syllam *fuisset ab orco reductus quo vel unico beneficio vir ille semet ab invidioso convicio vindicare poterat, quo contumeliosis versibus sibi fœlix dictus est, non reipublicæ. Nam Aristotelis lucubrationibus in lucem revocatis, non uni tantum urbi, sed universo orbi fœlix dici promeruit.* Idem ibid.

Quæ Plato & alii confusè, imperfectè, per fabularum in volucra & metaphorarum flosculos tradidissent, ea Aristoteles naturæ miraculum primus humano generi tradidit sub forma methodi dextræ regulatæ, & plenæ, &c. Præcepta in plenum corpus & systema methodicè, pulchre, homogenee conformavit, quod Dei donum in homine isto agnoscendum grato animo fuerat non lividis affectibus arridendum, &c. Keckermanus præcog. Logic. Tract. 2. *ut formam ita etiam materiam rerum Philosophicarum Aristoteli singulari Dei organo acceptam feremus. Ex hoc enim uberrimo fonte hauserunt philosophi reliqui quicquid posteris tradiderunt, &c. ut merito ingratissimi dicendi sunt, qui hunc authorem vel petulanter insectantur, vel juventuti odiosum reddere conantur.* Idem l. 2. Præcog. Philos. *Aristoteles dictus est* ἀρίστου τέλος, *quod perfectionem boni notat, nullam enim philosophiæ partem attigit, quam non perfectè tractavit.* Idem.

Quis dicat Aristotelem inutiliter laborasse, cum tanto artificio traderet rationem syllogismi demonstrativi, &c. atqui Aristoteles optimam navavit operam: suis enim illis præclarissimis regulis ostendit, saltem quo esset collimandum, si quis aliquid constanter probare vellet & firmiter. Petr. Martyr de justificatione.

Methodus Aristotelis omnium philosophorum excellen-

tissimi, pulcherrima sana & naturæ consentanea est, artiumq; omnium quæ ratione & via tractantur ordini persimilis. A communibus enim rerum initiis, ad proximas cujusq; causas progreditur, &c. Zanchius l. 1. c. 1. de Operibus Dei.

Quidam sunt qui vesana amentia, philosophiæ, ejusq; authoribus bellum indicere ausi; sunt illos intelligo qui cum alios veteres plerosq; omnes, tum Aristotelem, maxime, summum, bone Deus, virum, & unicam philosophiæ aquilam, omni calumniarum genere vexare, odiumq; illi & invidiam apud minus catos cautosq; homines conflare conati sunt, &c. Ingens est quæ ingentem hunc errorem fovet turba: turba tamen profecto est tantum, & ἀμούσων ἀνθρώπων, qui nec Sophiæ, nec Gratiis litarunt, ὄχλος, quas quidem vel melior institutio defecit, vel spes meliora consequendi, &c. Licentia est hæc ab animi impotentia summa profecta, qua isti calumniatores Aristotelis passim usi sunt: quorum libri si non famosi libelli potius sunt appellandi vel eo nomine dignissimi me judice sunt qui fiant Ἡφαίστω βόρα, quid quæso aliud aut sentire aut dicere possis de iis quos effrenata maledicendi libido eo evexiit ut summo & facundissimo philosopho cujus oratio adeo pura, casta, elegans ac sæpe etiam venustatū Atticarum plena est, ut facile quemvis è Græcis oratoribus possit provocare ignorationem, &c. objicere sustinuerint ô insignem prodigorum nominis sui confidentiam! itanè in tam erudito sæculo talia monstra reperiri potuerunt. Quid est tam sanctum quod audaculis isti contaminare non ausint, tanta est vanorum hominum vanitas & κενοδοξία judicium meum est, nullam esse pestem humano generi perniciosiorem, &c. Casaubonus Præfat. in Aristotelem.

If I should alledge all that hath been said by the great lights of learning in all ages since *Aristotle*, in his commendations, I should make a large book; but these few will suffice, to let Mr *Hobbs.*

Hobbs see, how he doth struggle not only against *Aristotle*, but against the most eminent men of all times; and withal, that it is not the Church of *Rome* alone, that makes use of *Aristotles* works, but likewise the Protestant Church: Therefore I have alledged the chief learned of the Protestants to justifie the Prince of Philosophers; whose testimonies I need not turn into English, for Mr. *Hobbs* understands well enough the language they write in: onely they that understand not the latin may take notice, that *Scaliger* calls *Aristotle*, the incomparable Heroe of learning, and the divine Eagle of knowledge. *Cardan* saith, That he excelled in all learning with incredible sagacity, without any conspicuous error. *Melancthon* saith, that *Aristotle* is so needful for a Common-wealth, that he should be carefully preserved and read in the schooles and universities, for without him no learning or method can be had; he saith, his language is so sweet, that nothing is sweeter. *Erasmus* acknowledgeth him to be the Prince and Perfecter of Philosophy, and the golden River, or rather a world of Wisdom; and that his works are a rich inestimable treasure; and laments, that the greatest parts of his books are lost, and praiseth L. *Sylla* for preserving these few we now enjoy. *Keckerman* calls him, the miracle of nature, his works the gift of God, and a principal organ of God for enriching the world with so much excellent learning, and that they are ungrate wretches who do not acknowledge it, but will rail against him for it. P. *Martyr* sheweth that *Aristotles* pains were profitable, his artifice great, his industry excellent, and his rules most notable. *Zanchie* saith, that he is of all Philosophers the most excellent, and that his method is most clear. *Casaubon* calls him with admiration,

miration: a man of men, the onely Eagle of Philosophy, whose stile is fraughted with Attick eloquence; and that they who write or speak against him are dunces, silly people, and such whose books are fit for nothing, but for the fire: *Scaliger* calls such, barbarous wits, Bats, Kites, Crows, Ravens, Owles, and Bats:

To conclude. I would have Mr. *Hobbs* take notice, that I have no quarrel against him, but against his tenets; I honor his worth and learning, but dislike his opinions; I know not his person, but I know and respect his parts; if there be any thing amiss in these my Animadvertions; (for we are all apt to mistake) I shall thank him if he will set me right, and inform me better: for I never had so great an opinion of my self, as not to yeeld to reason, and such as are able to convince my understanding: The God of truth direct us all into the way of truth. *Amen.*

FINIS

The

The Contents of each Chapter controverted.

INTRODUCTION.

THe world was not made by art or nature. Life is not the motion of the limbs.

Chap. 1. *The object causeth sensation, not sense. Fancy and sense different. Colour figured nothing. Sensible qualities are not motions. Motion produceth not motion. Outward and inward senses distinct. Fancy not the same in waking and dreaming men.*

Chap. 2. *A natural appetite in things inanimate, but without knowledge. Imagination is not decaying sense. Memory and imagination different.*

Chap. 3. *Things future have a being. Prophesie is not guessing. No absurdity to say the soul is all in all, and all in every part. To be born, no act of the minde. Some faculties are not acquired. Universalities are not names. Truth in things, as well as in names. Geometry not the onely Science.*

Chap. 3, 4. *Philosophy how Pedantry.*

Chap. 5. *Many things infused besides bodies. Extension how a body. Colour is in bodies, and sound in the air. A living creature is generical. The nature of a thing is its definition. Tropes and figures are not absurd speeches.*

Chap. 6. *Animal and voluntary not the same. Contempt and hatred not the same. Superstition and Religion not the same. Faith and Imagination not the same. The will is a rational appetite.*

Chap. 7. *Belief is not opinion. To have faith in, to*

trust

truſt to, and to beleeve a man, not the ſame. What is to beleeve in God. Our belief is not in the Church.

Chap. 8. *Devils, Demoniacks and mad-men not the ſame. Scholaſtick terms and Suarez intelligible.*

Chap. 10. *Pitty is not diſhonour. Laſting good fortune is no ſign of Gods favour. Ambition is not honorable, nor covetouſneſs. Injuſtice with power is not honourable: Goodneſs no leſs honorable then greatneſs.*

Chap. 11. *Felicity conſiſteth not in deſire*

Chap. 12. *Felicity is in injoying. Phyloſophy a ſupporter of the Church. The want of it the cauſe of confuſion and contradictions.*

Chap. 15. *All men are not equal by nature: Some are naturally fit for ſervice; Some for Dominion: Inequality neceſſary.*

Chap. 16. *Chriſt did not perſonate God.*

Chap: 18. *Covenants are not bare words, nor do all depend on the ſword. Princes may, but ſhould not be injurious to their ſubjects. Men may injure themſelves. Injury, Iniquity and Injuſtice the ſame thing.*

Chap. 20. *Kings and Tyrants different, how.* Samuel *deſcribeth a King; Moſes a Tyrant.*

Chap. 21. *David did injury to Uriah. How he offended againſt God onely. Freedom is not the ſame under a Monarchy and Democracy.* Ariſtotles *reaſon, why under Democracy, there is more liberty, then under a Monarchy.*

Chap. 28. *Mr.* Hobbs *contradicts himſelf, concerning the power which Subjects give to their Soveraigns. Pride is no cauſe of ſubmiſſion to government, but of Rebellion rather.*

Chap. 49. *The danger of acting againſt conſcience is no preſumption, but a duty to judge of good and evil. Faith is not attained by reaſon and ſtudy, but by infuſion.*

fusion and inspiration. Faith is a miracle. An account may be given of inspired faith. Prophesie and Faith not the same. Faith may stand with civil obedience. Princes are subject to their own laws. How every private man hath a property in his good.

Chap. 31. *The subjects of hope, love, and fear often confounded. God is not a name of relation. Natural reason, and the word of God different. Reason must be subject to faith. Our natural reason cannot purchase justice, peace, and religion. Natural reason is sometimes contrary to Gods word. Divine dreams are of force to win belief.*

Chap. 33. *How* Moses's *words are to be understood, concerning his own Sepulcher; And the Canaanite in* Abraham's *time being in the land,* Gen. 12.

Chap. 34. *Spirits are real parts of the universe, though not corporeal. Why substances are so called, The spirit that moved on the waters was not a winde. The word Ghost, what it signifieth. Aeriall bodies not visible delusions, may be seen by many at once. How spirits are in a place. Angels are not fancies or dreams. Why called gods. Why they appeared in mans shape. The Dove and fiery tongues were not Angels. Why Angels are distinguished by names. How evil Angels suffer by fire. How we shall be like the Angels in the resurrection. Faith excludes reason.*

Chap. 31. *Divers places of Scripture mis-alleadged by Mr.* Hobbs *for his earthly kingdom, and refuted. What* Holam *is, and Paradise, and the new* Jerusalem. *There is reason and authority to prove our happiness in heaven. Divers places of Scripture expounded to this purpose, and Mr.* Hobbs *his texts brought to the contrary, refuted. The souls immortality proved by Scripture.*

Chap. 38. *Christ proves as well the souls immortality, as the resurrection of the body to the Saduces. The*

souls

ſouls immortality proved by Scripoure. A place in Job *explained. The opinion of Chriſts earthly kingdom, and the ſouls ſleep are old hereſies. Hell is in the lower parts of the earth. How the Prophetical ſpeeches concerning Chriſts Kingdom are to be underſtood. We ſhall aſcend higher then Gods foot-ſtool.*

Chap 41. *Chriſt hath not been all this while ſince his reſurrection without a Kingdom. Differring of puniſhments and rewards here, no argument that Chriſt hath no Kingdom. What it is to ſit in* Moſes's *chair. Other places of Scripture expounded.*

Chap. 42. *The bleſſed Trinity vindicated, and proved out of the old Teſtament. Chriſts Kingdom is in this world, though not of this world. Diſſimulation in religion condemned. The Apoſtles made laws, and had power to command. Diſobedience a great ſin. Miniſter and ſervant the ſame thing. Princes why ſhepherds; their baptiſm doth not authoriſe them to preach.* Urim *and* Thummim *given to* Aaron, *not to* Moſes. *The Romans had the legiſlative power over the Jews. Excommunication a puniſhment. Chriſts Kingdom is ſpiritual, though the ſubjects are cloathed with fleſh. In Common-wealths there is a dependance, as well as a coherence. Hereſie, what it is, and who be Hereticks.*

Chap. 45. *Our faith depends not upon mans reputation and authority.*

Chap. 44. *Devils and Fantaſms, or Idols are not the ſame. Chriſts Kingdom here is the Kingdom of Grace. The ſoul how immortal. The wicked live eternally. The tree of life. Life ſometimes called death. The ſoul how taken in Scripture. The Scripture is plain for the ſouls immortality. Ghoſt-walking what it is. Eternal torments no dark doctrine. Chriſts Transfiguration was not the Kingdom of God.* Solomons *words* Eccleſ. 12.7. *and* Eccleſ. 3.21.

con-

concerning the ſoul, expounded. And Eccleſ. 3.19. Enoch's *tranſlation. Better be dead, then live in miſery.* Abraham's *ſoul is alive actually. That the torments of the wicked are eternal, proved. Man ſhall not be in the ſame condition after the reſurrection, that* Adam *was after his fall.*

Chap. 45. *Devils which Chriſt caſt out were not diſeaſes. Angels and Mens ſouls are not corporeal ſpirits. Chriſts temptation in the deſart was real, and no viſion. Exoreiſms uſeful in the Church now. Many poſſeſſed in theſe latter times. It was Satan, and not a treacherous intention that entered into* Judas.

Chap. 46. *Mr.* Hobbs *taxed for his exorbitant ſpeeches againſt* Ariſtotle *and the other Phyloſophers. Men are not frighted from obedience by ſeparated eſſences. Graces are inſpired or poured into us. Inſpiration excludeth not obedience to the laws. The tearms* definitive *and* circumſcriptive *diſtinguiſhed. The ſoul is all in every part of the body. Incorporeal ſubſtances capable of torment. Metaphyſick not repugnant to natural reaſon, proved by divers maximes. Quantity increaſeth and decreaſeth with the matter. What St.* Paul *means by vain Phyloſophy. God is no waies the author of injuſtice, or ſin. The appetite of the State and of private men is not the ſame.* Ariſtotle *vindicated from calling kingly, or any other government, but popular tyrannical. How theſe words of* Ariſtotle *are to be underſtood, Men ſhould not govern, but the laws. Mr.* Hobbs *his new Tenent rejected.*

Chap. 47. *Romaniſts and Presbyterians do not hold that the Kingdom of glory is in this world.* Pontifex Maximus *at* Rome *above the civil State.* Ariſtotle, *Phyloſophy, and School-Divinity vindicated. Mr.* Hobbs *is cenſured for ſlighting* Ariſtotle, *who is highly commended, and his obtrectators reproved by divers eminent Proteſtant writers.*

FINIS